1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY 2 3 CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: IN RE: VALSARTAN PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION 19-md-02875-RBK-KMW 5 CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE 6 VIA TELECONFERENCE 7 Mitchell H. Cohen Building & U.S. Courthouse 4th & Cooper Streets 8 Camden, New Jersey 08101 June 25, 2021 9 Commencing at 10:00 10 THE HONORABLE ROBERT B. KUGLER BEFORE: UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE AND 11 SPECIAL MASTER THE HONORABLE THOMAS I. VANASKIE 12 APPEARANCES: 13 MAZIE SLATER KATZ & FREEMAN, LLC 14 BY: ADAM M. SLATER, ESQUIRE 103 Eisenhower Parkway 15 Roseland, New Jersey 07068 For the Plaintiffs 16 GOLOMB & HONIK, P.C. 17 BY: RUBEN HONIK, ESQUIRE 1835 Market Street, Suite 2900 18 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103 For the Plaintiffs 19 LEVIN PAPANTONIO THOMAS MITCHELL RAFFERTY PROCTOR, P.A. 20 BY: DANIEL A. NIGH, ESQUIRE 316 S. Baylen, Suite 600 21 Pensacola, Florida 32502 For the Plaintiffs 22 Camille Pedano, Official Court Reporter 23 camillepedano@gmail.com 609-774-1494 2.4 Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript 25 produced by computer-aided transcription.

```
1
    APPEARANCES (Continued):
 2
         WATTS, GUERRA, LLP
         BY: PAIGE BOLDT, ESQUIRE
 3
         4 Dominion Drive, Building 3, Suite 100
         San Antonio, Texas 78257
 4
         For the Plaintiffs
 5
         BRENT COON & ASSOCIATES
         BY: ROBERT STEWART
 6
         1500 Walnut Street
         Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102
 7
         For the Plaintiffs
 8
         DUANE MORRIS LLP
         BY:
              SETH A. GOLDBERG, ESQUIRE
 9
              JESSICA PRISELAC, ESQUIRE
         30 South 17th Street
10
         Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
         For the Defendants, Prinston Pharmaceuticals,
11
         Solco Healthcare U.S. LLC, and
         Zhejiang Huahai Pharmaceuticals Ltd.
12
         GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP
13
         BY: VICTORIA DAVIS LOCKARD, ESQUIRE
              STEVEN M. HARKINS, ESQUIRE
14
         3333 Piedmont Road, NE, Suite 2500
         Atlanta, Georgia 30305
15
         For the Defendants, Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd.,
         Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., Actavis LLC,
16
         and Actavis Pharma, Inc.
17
         HILL WALLACK, LLP
         BY: NAKUL Y. SHAH, ESQUIRE
18
         21 Roszel Road
         Princeton, New Jersey 08540
19
         For the Defendants, Hetero Drugs and Hetero Labs
20
    ALSO PRESENT:
21
         LORETTA SMITH, ESQUIRE
         Judicial Law Clerk to The Honorable Robert B. Kugler
22
         LARRY MacSTRAVIC, Courtroom Deputy
23
         ANNA EDNEY, Reporter with Bloomberg News
24
25
```

```
1
    (PROCEEDINGS held via teleconference before The Honorable
 2
    Robert B. Kugler, United States District Judge, and Special
 3
    Master The Honorable Thomas I Vanaskie, at 10:00 a.m.)
 4
             JUDGE VANASKIE: All right. Who do we have as the
 5
    spokesperson for the plaintiffs?
 6
             Mr. Slater, are you there?
 7
             (No response).
 8
             JUDGE VANASKIE: Not yet.
 9
             Mr. Goldberg, are you there?
10
             MR. GOLDBERG: I am, Your Honor.
11
             JUDGE VANASKIE: All right. We're waiting for a
12
    spokesperson for the plaintiffs.
13
           All right. Is there anyone on the line for the
14
    plaintiffs?
15
             MR. HONIK: Your Honor, Ruben Honik here. I was
16
    expecting Mr. Slater to join because, as you know, most of the
17
    issues are ZHP issues. And for better or worse, I'm behind the
18
    wheel of an automobile and unable to ping him; but perhaps if
19
    one of the other plaintiff leadership is on, they can ping Mr.
20
    Slater.
21
             MR. GEDDIS: Hi, this is Chris Geddis.
22
             MR. SLATER: Hello, Judge. It's Adam Slater. I'm
23
    sorry, I just -- it wouldn't let me get into the password.
24
    finally let me in.
25
             JUDGE VANASKIE: Okay, good.
```

```
1
             MR. SLATER: I can't explain why but it was not fun.
 2
    Sorry about that.
 3
             JUDGE VANASKIE: That's okay. I think we're ready to
 4
    go.
 5
           And I did want to let you all know that we have, I
    believe, on the line, I'll ask, Ms. Edney, are you on the line?
 6
 7
             MS. EDNEY: Yes, I'm here, Judge.
 8
             JUDGE VANASKIE: Now, we have on this call Anna Edney
 9
    from Bloomberg News. She asked whether she could attend the
10
    conference and permission has been granted, after conferring
11
    with Judge Kugler. So just so you know that Ms. Edney is
12
    covering this conference. And we will now proceed to conduct
13
    the conference.
14
             I have agenda letters from both sides of the matter
15
    and the first item I wanted to address is the status of Mr.
16
    Chen's custodial file productions and deposition schedule.
17
           Mr. Slater, I'll give you the floor.
18
             MR. SLATER: Thank you, Your Honor.
19
           In accordance with Your Honor's orders, the custodial
20
    file is due to be served July 12. With regard to that, I guess
21
    ZHP had said that they seem to be on target. I think that we
22
    would appreciate some concrete assurance and we've asked some
23
    questions during the meet and confer the other day, as we put
2.4
    in our letter, to find out what is going to be the size of the
25
    production and what is going to be the scope of any privileges
```

```
1 or state secrets that are asserted because I thought that was 2 --
```

JUDGE VANASKIE: I'm going to interrupt for a second, Mr. Slater.

We do have a standing protocol for these calls that unless you're speaking, please mute your phone. So I'll ask anybody who's on the line, other than Mr. Slater, myself and Mr. Goldberg, to please mute your line.

Thank you.

2.4

All right. Go ahead, Mr. Slater.

MR. SLATER: Okay. I thought that -- and I think it would be very helpful to the plaintiffs and to the Court to have an understanding sooner rather than later as to the scope of any privilege or state secret assertions that may be made because I would assume that in order to most efficiently address those, we would want to start to plan for how we're going to meet and confer on them and, based on past history, how we're going to submit any disputes to Your Honor so that it can be done in an orderly fashion that's convenient for Your Honor. And then, obviously, that all ties to getting the deposition scheduled, which is something we would like to get on the calendar. So we're just trying to get this in an orderly fashion laid out so we know exactly what to expect and we can then schedule it in a way that Your Honor is comfortable with and that we can all work with.

1 JUDGE VANASKIE: All right. Mr. Goldberg. 2 MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, I will defer to Ms. 3 Priselac on the production of Mr. Chen's custodial file. 4 In terms of the deposition, as we mention in the letter, 5 Your Honor, as we mentioned to plaintiffs' counsel, I believe 6 it was yesterday or Wednesday, I'm sorry, when Your Honor 7 issued the ruling on his deposition, it was already nighttime 8 China time. We did get the ruling to ZHP on Wednesday. 9 obviously needed time to find a time to confer with ZHP about 10 the ruling. As Your Honor knows, this is a very important 11 issue to ZHP and we and ZHP are evaluating the ruling. And at 12 this time we do not have deposition dates. We believe it's --13 ZHP does need some time to evaluate how to proceed and, you 14 know, we intend to confer with Mr. Slater once a determination 15 in that regard has been made. 16 JUDGE VANASKIE: All right. Well, all that is 17 understandable. I understand why you need to confer on this 18 very, very important issue and determine how you're going to 19 proceed. But I do think we may need to put some time limit on

this evaluation process.

How much time do you think it will take?

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MR. GOLDBERG: Well, Your Honor, we -- I suspect -- we have a holiday next week. Of course, there is time if ZHP decides to raise this issue with Judge Kugler, that would have to be done I believe by July 13th. So there is a natural time

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

```
limit to this and it actually coincides with the completion of
the document production. And so we would respectfully request
that we have that time to consider how to proceed on this very
important issue.
```

I should mention, Your Honor, that there are some other logistical issues just in terms of scheduling the deposition.

Mr. Slater, as you mention, has asked that the deposition be scheduled at a time that would a lot -- allow for the resolution of any motion practice related to the document production. So I think it would be helpful to have a more clear picture of that as well before we put dates on the schedule.

We also have the issue of summer vacations. Mr. Slater and I spoke about that last week and have agreed to try to accommodate one another's vacations.

And then, of course, there's the issue of Mr. Chen's own schedule and the issuance of the travel permit for Mr. Chen, which has not yet occurred.

So I would suspect over the next couple of weeks, by definition, with respect to whether we would raise this issue with Judge Kugler, we'll have a very clear picture of how the ZHP parties will proceed, where we are with the document production, where we are with any potential motion practice related to that document production.

JUDGE VANASKIE: All right. Mr. Slater?

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MR. SLATER: Thank you, Judge.

You know, in being practical, I certainly did not intend to invite ZHP to turn this into a months-and-months-long I was simply flagging a couple of issues which I figure that ZHP knows quite a bit more than what they're sharing with us. For example, they should be able to tell Your Honor enough on the record now how many documents were identified in his custodial file that were hit by the search terms, what's the preliminary count of any document they might claim privilege on or state secrets. I don't think that that's something that's going to merit long, extensive briefing schedules, in light of the fact that we've already briefed these issues for Your Honor and you've already either ruled on or are imminently going to rule on many of the legal issues, so it'll just be a question of slotting some documents potentially into a framework Your Honor will have already established. We're certainly not looking to delay this. We think that we should start to talk about dates.

I guess that counsel's considering an appeal, is what we've heard for the first time today, to Judge Kugler. They have the right to do that but I don't think that that stays their obligation to start to put dates on the calendar and to start to schedule how we're going to handle this. And that's what I think needs to be imposed because what I'm hearing here is summer is going to go by and by the time we're done with

2.4

this, it's going to be November, and that's not where we want to be. We want to take this deposition in a very reasonable period of time. And we're talking August, that's two months out. So it's not like we're asking to do the deposition next week.

JUDGE VANASKIE: Understood. As you acknowledge, Mr. Slater, certainly ZHP has the right to seek review of the decision by Judge Kugler and I believe Mr. Goldberg is correct, I think it's a 21-day period for asserting or taking exception to the rule and seeking Judge Kugler's decision; and I guess that takes us to July 13. And certainly you're within your rights in using that time, Mr. Goldberg.

I do want to move this matter along but I think in terms of scheduling the deposition itself, it has to await the decision whether to seek Judge Kugler's review of the decision that I made, and I don't see any way to expedite that now other than having the parties act in good faith, making sure that whatever decisions are made are made on the basis of the law and the facts and we go from there.

I do agree with you, Mr. Slater, on the document production. That can proceed.

And so I did want to ask Mr. Goldberg where things stand with respect to matters that were raised by Mr. Slater, such as, an account of documents on which the search terms have hit, for example. Do we have any sense at this time of the size of

```
1
    the universe of documents, potentially relevant documents, that
    we're looking at?
 3
             MR. GOLDBERG: Thank you, Your Honor. For this I'm
 4
    going to defer to my colleague, Jessica Priselac.
 5
             JUDGE VANASKIE: Thank you. Yes.
 6
             MS. PRISELAC: Good morning, Your Honor. Jessica
 7
    Priselac for the ZHP parties.
 8
           I was -- during the meet and confer earlier this week,
 9
    we did, in fact, tell Mr. Slater that we had collected over
10
    20,000 documents from Mr. Chen's custodial file. And as an
11
    update, it was actually closer to 30,000 documents that were
12
    ultimately collected. I was able to get a preliminary search
13
    term hit count, and the preliminary search term hit count is
14
    approximately 4,700 documents. So our reviewers are in the
15
    process of reviewing those documents and we haven't had any
16
    additional technical glitches, I think Your Honor will be happy
17
    to hear, and so the review is proceeding and we believe that we
18
    will meet the Court's deadline.
             JUDGE VANASKIE: Okay. Thank you.
19
20
           Anything else on that point, Mr. Slater?
21
             MR. SLATER: I don't think so, Your Honor. I think I
22
    understand your ruling. I understand exactly what you're
23
    saying and I think we'll bide our time and wait for more
2.4
    information and look forward to the production of the
2.5
    documents.
```

2.4

JUDGE VANASKIE: I want you all to understand that my interest is to keep this matter moving as efficiently and as expeditiously as possible within the framework of the rules; and I will expect us to be addressing this matter of the scheduling of Mr. Chen's deposition at the next conference as well because, ultimately, my judgment, it will occur and it needs to occur but that, obviously, is a matter that can be raised with Judge Kugler by ZHP.

Is there anything else, then, with respect to Mr. Chen's custodial file and scheduling of his deposition?

MR. SLATER: Your Honor, maybe I'll ask one other question, and I apologize I didn't ask it before.

There had been some statements by ZHP along the way of potentially objecting to Mr. Chen leaving China to be deposed. I'm assuming from what Mr. Goldberg said that that's not an argument that's going to be raised and that if the appeal to Judge Kugler is denied, if that actually happens, that he will be produced. I thought maybe it'd just be a good idea just to make sure that's not going to become an issue because that, obviously, would raise some significant questions.

JUDGE VANASKIE: Are you able -- sorry.

MR. SLATER: I'm sorry, Judge. I didn't add, just for Your Honor's information, what had been suggested to us at one point was that because he had some sort of an affiliation with the government that he might not be willing to leave the

1 country to be deposed as all the other witnesses did. 2 suppose it probably makes sense just to make sure for the 3 record today that that's not an argument we're going to hear. 4 JUDGE VANASKIE: Are you able to address that at this 5 time, Mr. Goldberg? 6 MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, I can address it in the 7 sense that at this point we do not have a -- a travel permit has not been issued for Mr. Chen. Mr. Slater is correct that 8 9 Mr. Chen, and as Your Honor knows, and as we've set forth in 10 our briefs, Mr. Chen is in a different category than all of the 11 other witnesses. He does have roles with the Chinese 12 government and the review of his travel permit, as I understand 13 it, would be different than the other ZHP employees who have 14 been deposed; but at this point I do not have any further 15 insight into whether Mr. Chen's travel permit will be issued. 16 At this point it has not yet occurred. 17 JUDGE VANASKIE: Okay. All right. Thank you very 18 much for that, Mr. Goldberg. I think that's all we can do at 19 this point in time. It is now raised, the matter, that has 20 been brought to my attention, at least, and we will continue to 21 follow it; but I don't think there 's anything else we can do 22 on that question at this time. 23 Now, where do things stand with respect to the -- what 2.4 are called the new discovery requests or the supplemental 25 production, depending upon whose title we're using? Is it Ms.

```
1
    Priselac that will be addressing this matter?
 2
             MS. PRISELAC: Yes, Your Honor.
 3
             JUDGE VANASKIE: All right. Where do things stand,
 4
    Ms. Priselac?
 5
             MS. PRISELAC: Your Honor, I think you may have
 6
    noticed that our perception of this week's meet and confer and
 7
    plaintiffs' perception of this week's meet and confer were a
 8
    little different, but I think it makes sense for me to kind of
 9
    address how the plaintiffs set forth their request for relief
10
    in their letter.
11
           Just in an overall sense, Your Honor, our position is
12
    still that the production was substantially complete. As a
13
    result of the meet and confer, we agreed to do certain things
14
    like identify certain types of documents, provide more
15
    employment information for certain custodians, things that are
16
    normal in either our quality check process or in the
17
    meet-and-confer process in a production of this scope and
18
    timing.
19
           But in today's plaintiffs' letter, I just want to point
20
    out to Your Honor that the section of plaintiffs' letter that
21
    talks about the additional discovery requests reflects a trend
22
    of the plaintiffs when it comes to the ZHP parties' production
23
    in that it made really a series of baseless, unsupported
24
    allegations about the document production itself or about what
25
    certain documents in the production purport to say but they
```

2.4

don't actually connect those allegations to any evidence or any requests for relief.

One particular example in the letter, Your Honor, is that plaintiffs, once again, talk about this 2017 Jinsheng Lin email regarding an irbesartan improvement project and, once again, mischaracterizing what that email actually says.

Now, as plaintiffs are well aware, that email is totally and completely unrelated to the only disputed request for relief in their letter, because the only disputed request for relief in their letter relates to nitrosamine testing records. And those nitrosamine testing records, the plaintiffs well know, relate to tests that were conducted well after 2017 and well after the detection of the NDMA impurity in valsartan API which happened in 2018.

And, Your Honor, while I'm prepared to go line by line to refute all the allegations that are in plaintiffs' letter, my instinct is that you would probably like to focus on the heart of this matter, which is the actual disputed requests for the relief, which I'll do in a moment. But, you know, if Your Honor believes that breaking down all of the unrelated allegations in the letter would be helpful as it relates to any disputes going forward, then the ZHP parties would respectfully request that they be given an opportunity to have a hearing by Zoom in which we could present certain demonstrative exhibits to Your Honor that would contradict the plaintiffs'

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
mischaracterizations of the document productions and the
evidence. Because it's clear to us at this point, especially
based on this latest letter here, that the plaintiffs' tactic
is to just smear ZHP with a broad brush in the hope that it
will somehow color the Court's view when it comes to very
specific and, quite frankly, unrelated discovery disputes such
as the one that's presented in the agenda letter today.
         JUDGE VANASKIE: All right. Let's hear from Mr.
Slater, then.
         MR. SLATER: Thank you, Your Honor.
       I guess I'll consider this to be my response to the
preliminaries. But I wrote down what counsel said that we're
making, as plaintiffs, baseless allegations and
mischaracterizing Jinsheng Lin's email. So let me try to make
it very clear, if I can.
       There are some major deficiencies in this production,
the likes of which I have not seen in any litigation that I
have ever been in. For example, this is a case, as Your Honor
knows, where ZHP has told the world since 2018 that they didn't
know there was NDMA in its valsartan until Novartis figured it
out for them in June 2018 and told them. We have an email from
somebody who is a senior scientist at the facility that does
all of the testing that would have discovered the NDMA, and, lo
```

and behold, on July 27, 2017, Dr. Jinsheng Lin writes in an

email that an impurity that they were seeing, which was

```
1
    nitrosamine impurity, in irbesartan seems very similar --
 2
             MS. PRISELAC: Your Honor --
 3
             MR. SLATER: Can I finish please?
 4
             -- that seems very similar --
 5
             MS. PRISELAC:
                           I actually -- I actually --
 6
             MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor --
 7
             MS. PRISELAC: Your Honor --
 8
             JUDGE VANASKIE: I will let Mr. Slater continue, Mr.
 9
    Goldberg, and then we will hear from you.
10
           Are we getting into information that is protected by a
11
    confidentiality order?
12
             MS. PRISELAC: Yes.
13
             MR. GOLDBERG: Yes. Yes, Your Honor, that's the only
14
    concern we have, in light of the presence of the reporter --
15
             JUDGE VANASKIE: Yes, of Bloomberg.
16
             MR. GOLDBERG: -- of Bloomberg. It is a confidential
17
    issue and we don't -- you know, obviously, we need to have this
18
    discussion in confidence with the Court.
19
             MR. SLATER: I get it.
20
             JUDGE VANASKIE: Well, is the document labeled
21
    pursuant to the confidentiality order?
22
             MR. GOLDBERG: Yes, Your Honor.
23
             MR. SLATER: Your Honor, this is Adam Slater.
2.4
           The document was labeled that way. However, the
25
    document, my understanding is, awhile ago, long -- the stay on
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the obligations of ZHP to move to seal that document has expired. It was attached to papers a long time ago. The deposition testimony of Min Li was referenced in papers a long time ago that were filed with the Court. There was no motion ever filed by ZHP to seal that. That is expired. There is no confidentiality as to this information nor could there ever be confidentiality as to this issue, which, frankly, is in our agenda letter which was filed with the Court yesterday and is sitting on the docket on ECF and the defense knows that and they recognize that it's completely appropriate for us to place that in a public record, the fact that ZHP knew there was NDMA in valsartan in 2017. I'm stunned that they're interrupting this on that basis.

JUDGE VANASKIE: All right. Let me hear either from Mr. Goldberg or Ms. Priselac.

MS. PRISELAC: Your Honor, first to address what's currently in the public domain, what's in the public domain is a complete and total mischaracterization of what the email actually says.

And to that point, Your Honor, you know, Mr. Slater's just proving my point. There's no request for relief related to this email in his letter. What he's simply trying to do is smear ZHP, once again, with a mischaracterization of this email, which is why I opened my remarks, Your Honor, with a request that if we would like to get into what this email

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

```
actually says that we have a Zoom hearing so we can present
this email and break it down for Your Honor in a way that is,
quite frankly, protected under the confidentiality order
because the email itself contains highly technical information
and analysis related to a product that is, at the moment, not
the issue -- not the subject of discovery --
         MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor --
         MS. PRISELAC: -- and that would be irbesartan.
         JUDGE VANASKIE: Right. Go ahead, Mr. Goldberg.
         MR. GOLDBERG: This is -- thank you.
       And with respect to the confidentiality, we have not had
the opportunity to meet and confer with plaintiffs on this.
understanding is that one of my colleagues who's been handling
the confidentiality issues has been in touch with one of Mr.
Slater's colleagues, Cheryll Calderon, on the confidentiality
issues, and we believe this issue is one of those that needs to
be addressed. But, you know, the concern here is that, as Ms.
Priselac raised, mischaracterizing a document, using an
opportunity to grandstand in front of the national reporter
about it, is really not what we expected when we got on this
call; and a Zoom hearing, in the confidence of Your Honor,
where we can discuss this document, is really more appropriate
until the confidentiality issues have been resolved.
         JUDGE VANASKIE: All right. I'll give you the final
word, Mr. Slater, and then I'll let you know how we're going to
```

proceed here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MR. SLATER: Okay. Number one, there is nothing to meet and confer on as the deadline has passed for the defense to move to seal. That's number one.

Number two, I didn't know that a reporter was going to I'm not grandstanding. And, in fact, part of be on this call. our request is specifically for the data underlying the statement in the email, which has not been produced to us; and, frankly, Your Honor, neither was the email produced to us in Mr. Lin's own custodial file nor is he even named as any duplicate custodian. Your Honor is well aware, as we laid out in our letter, we believe, and I'm not going to pull any punches because today's not a pulling punches kind of day, we believe that ZHP deliberately scrubbed their documents before they produced their documents and that that copy of the email, we didn't even get an electronic version, we got a copy of it, came through to us because the date created was changed when they copied it to a date after the revelation of the That's why it only came through as a copy in contamination. Min Li's custodial file with the other ten or 12 recipients and the sender none of them listed as duplicate custodians on that document. We believe there's massive, massive impropriety in the document production by ZHP. And for ZHP to say that we're not linking this to any requests, Your Honor, we've pointed out the document counts are low, we've pointed out the date ranges,

2.4

we have Peng Dong who received that email where we got no emails from him before December 12, 2017. I mean, this is not some thing that we're throwing out to try to draw attention to. This is one of the most astounding revelations in a litigation that I've ever seen where a document like this comes out. This literally is a smoking-gun document. This literally is in Wikipedia, next to smoking gun, you can give this example.

So I understand why ZHP is coming back at this so hard because it's probably the only response that they can, because, factually or legally, they have no grounds to stand on.

And finally, we absolutely object to this request to try to turn this into some sort of sideshow on Zoom. You know when we've asked about this document? Of multiple witnesses during depositions.

And the last thing I'll say is, Jun Du, who I deposed several weeks ago, when I was going through with him, kept saying, well, where's the data and the underlying documents to where he came up to that understanding that what he described in that email occurred? You know what my response was? Yeah, we'd like to see those, too, because they weren't produced to us, and they clearly either exist or existed. And that's why we asked ZHP the other day to make sure that they preserved all of the G.C. machines, all of the gas chromatography machines, all the mass spectrometers that were used for years, and all the data's been preserved because we are likely to ask for that

now so that we can then clean those, whatever you call them, hard drives or whatever they are where all that data is, and look at all the testing to go find where that test was done and where that analysis was done before July 2017.

JUDGE VANASKIE: Thank you, Mr. Slater.

This is obviously a very serious issue and one that's hotly contested, and understandably so. The accusations that are being leveled against ZHP are, indeed, most serious and I think under these circumstances it would be appropriate to conduct a hearing, we can do the hearing via Zoom, and we can conduct it in camera, in light of the assertions being made that this is information that has been designated as confidential. And it may be, Mr. Slater, that they have missed the deadline in terms of seeking to seal a particular document or documents and the consequences for that would be that it is no longer protected, I understand that; but this has to be presented to me in an appropriate fashion and over the -- having it presented to me via telephone conference doesn't enable me to make a decision with a great deal of confidence.

So I will schedule a Zoom hearing on the adequacy of the ZHP production of a document related to the new discovery requests, this supplemental production, so it won't be limited to the July 27, 2017, email, it certainly will encompass the July 27, 2017, email, and the parties should be expected to address the question of whether the email itself is entitled to

3

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

matter.

```
protection under the confidentiality order that was issued by
the Court in this matter, or whether any protection under that
order has been lost or waived. I will -- it won't be next week
that we have the hearing but I will look to conduct it very
soon. And I think that's all we can say on this particular
issue right now.
       I know there are a couple of matters I wanted to
address. Ms. Priselac, you talked about going line by line.
I'm not sure we need to go line by line at this time, but I do
want to find out where things stand with respect to issues
raised by plaintiffs concerning missing devices or inoperable
```

So, Ms. Priselac, can you bring us up to date on that? MS. PRISELAC: Sure, Your Honor.

devices, the discovery that was being sought on that particular

During our meet and confer, we let the plaintiffs know that we had identified some documents in the production and also documents that will be produced no later than Monday that show the realtime happenings, as they were, rather than a declaration of, you know, Dr. Li's computer breaking, what he did with respect to IT, and other documents that relate to his possession of the laptop that was replaced. So those documents will be produced no later than Monday.

JUDGE VANASKIE: Did you want to be heard on that issue, Mr. Slater?

1 MR. SLATER: I would. Thank you, Your Honor. 2 We were told during the meet and confer that, and I 3 believe it may be -- I can't -- there's so many devices that 4 either broke or had to be replaced, but I believe it might have been the phone, the iPhone or a similar device, from Dr. Li, 6 that it wasn't provided by the company and he did it 7 personally, and the order certainly encompassed that the 8 records from any source. So if he went to the local, I'm going 9 to analogize it, I don't know -- I don't know which store he 10 went to, but whichever local store he went to, he bought the 11 phone there himself, which is what we're being told, I'm a bit 12 incredulous about it but, you know, we'll see what we get, the 13 order encompassed that as well to get whatever documentation it 14 We were told during the meet and confer that they're not 15 going to produced anything he personally did. If it was a 16 personal purchase and wasn't done by the company, they're not 17 going to give that to us even though that's been ordered. So 18 there's a disconnect here, perhaps I'm not understanding or 19 perhaps ZHP has changed its position, but that's what we were 20 told on the phone the other day. 21 JUDGE VANASKIE: All right. Ms. Priselac. 22 MS. PRISELAC: Your Honor, we don't believe that the 23 order encompassed any non-ZHP device and we've made it clear to 24 the plaintiffs over the period of several months, beginning at 25 least since I was involved in this since December of last year,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

that based on Chinese law, there's no way that an employer can force an individual to give over personal data or information. And if they wanted to get personal data or personal information about any ZHP employee, they were going to have to serve a subpoena and get Haque service on that individual. This hasn't come up before yesterday -- or, I'm sorry, Wednesday, this hasn't come up since December. Since December they've made no attempt to subpoena or get personal records through any lawful means of any individual that works for ZHP. And so to suddenly decide -- and there's a whole litany, quite frankly, Your Honor, in the letter that has been, you know, put to bed several months ago that suddenly now Mr. Slater is bringing up again for the first time in months. And so our position is that the plaintiffs have never served any ZHP employee with any subpoena or any lawful request for their personal data, and ZHP is not in a position to force its employees to turn that information over. MR. SLATER: Your Honor, if I could briefly respond please? JUDGE VANASKIE: You may. MR. SLATER: Thank you. Well, I guess the dam is bursting now because what we just heard is that ZHP's position they didn't have to comply with the ESI protocol. Any device that was used for work

purposes was supposed to be collected, the data was supposed to

2.5

that should have been.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MS. PRISELAC: Your Honor, may I respond?

2 JUDGE VANASKIE: Certainly.

MS. PRISELAC: Thank you, Your Honor.

Let me be clear that this discussion about people's personal devices has -- was first, to my knowledge, discussed with the plaintiffs in December, and they were well aware then, and, quite frankly, they've been well aware since our substantial completion of the production through metadata that there is no personal device metadata and there is no personal device data produced, and that's because they've had this information for now close to seven months. It's very easy to tell in our production where all of these documents came from. And if they had an issue that none of it came from a cell phone of a particular employee, that's something they could have highlighted, you know, I'll give them three months to have looked through the production or the metadata. Even with that, they could have brought this up months and months ago.

The reality, Your Honor, as much as Mr. Slater would like to say that this document is a smoking gun, it's not a smoking gun whatsoever. It's the last gasp of plaintiff. reality is they haven't found what they wanted, they found one document they could mischaracterize, and this is what they've bet their whole case on. That's their choice. But that doesn't mean there's spoliation. And, quite frankly, to make allegations of spoliation or destruction of documents without

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

any evidence whatsoever is completely improper.

And, Your Honor, with respect to this idea that, you know, that somehow our client has, I think the word Mr. Slater used was "scrubbed", you know, certain devices or not produced certain emails, this brings me back to my original point, which is, the plaintiffs are crying out all of these allegations but if you read their letter closely, they haven't asked for any relief. The only relief they've asked for is about these nitrosamine testing records which I can get to. But the point here is, Your Honor, how can we, as ZHP, properly respond to anything that the plaintiffs are throwing out there when they're not making the appropriate motions, they're not making the appropriate requests for relief, and, quite frankly, Your Honor, the reason they're doing so is because if they were forced to write a motion about these things, if they were forced to ask Your Honor for appropriate relief, they couldn't do it because there's no evidence to support these allegations.

So I would request, Your Honor, that before we have this Zoom hearing that the plaintiffs make clear what they think the deficiencies actually are rather than just taking a broad swipe and actually ask for a certain request for relief, because we're entitled to be on notice about what they think is missing, why they think it's missing, and what they want in response.

MR. SLATER: Your Honor, can I have 30 seconds?

2.4

JUDGE VANASKIE: Go ahead. You can have more than 30 seconds.

MR. SLATER: Thanks. I won't take long.

I think that it's clear that we've asked for relief and we have been doing our darndest to try to lay these things out for Your Honor as clear as we could, but there was one thing counsel said, and I was surprised she went back to it, but I have to make sure that this is clear for the Court and so Your Honor knows this. I think we laid it out in the letter but if I wasn't clear, I want to make sure I am.

After that email was sent, a report was prepared with regard to the subject of that email. And we've gone through this with ZHP ad nauseam saying where is that report, because the last reference to the report in April of 2018 was that Dr. Min Li, the vice president of analytical operations for ZHP, directed the people who wrote the report not to issue it, not to do any more work on it, because of the, quote, unquote, sensitive impurity discussed in the report. That was in April of 2018, and that report, which we've been asking for through the Court and through meet and confers, ZHP has now conceded is gone and cannot be --

MS. PRISELAC: That's absolutely not true.

MR. SLATER: It hasn't been produced and we've been told that they can't find it and they're substantially complete with their production; so unless someone's going to pull it out

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

```
of their back pocket today. We've made it clear in back and
forth with ZHP we wanted it; they've made it clear they can't
find it.
         MS. PRISELAC: Your Honor --
         JUDGE VANASKIE: All right. Ms. Priselac.
         MS. PRISELAC: -- I must respond to this because it's
absolutely not true. We've never written that, I've never said
it, and, in fact, I directed Mr. Slater and his team to ZHP038,
which is the group of documents that were collected in response
to that specific request; and when I asked them once if they
had actually read them, they would not say yes.
       Now, I understand they're highly technical and all in
Chinese. So if Mr. Slater wants to go on the record to say
today he and his team have read every single one of those
documents and it's not in there, I'd like him to do so because
I've never said that that report doesn't exist.
         MR. SLATER: Well, it's my understanding that our team
read all the documents. On the call the other day, Cheryll
Calderon responded to your question and said, yes, we have been
through all the documents and --
         MS. PRISELAC: I asked read.
         MR. SLATER: -- it's everything that we've been told
-- my understanding is the document was not produced and if you
want to tell us where it is, we'll be happy to see it now.
         JUDGE VANASKIE: All right. You know, one of the
```

reasons we raise these issues by letter is to keep the matter moving along because motion practice certainly slows the progress of a case such as this one.

I believe that plaintiffs certainly have raised repeatedly specific deficiencies with respect to the productions that have been made in this matter, but it appears that we're heading to the unavoidable need for a motion from plaintiffs to compel discovery, to compel production, identifying the deficiencies in the production, to be followed by a response from ZHP, with a hearing, evidentiary hearing, to be held via Zoom or in some other way so we can get this matter resolved. But we are not going to follow the normal timeframe specified in the rules for a motion of this importance. I want to get it resolved promptly.

Mr. Slater, how quickly can the plaintiffs present a motion that identifies what plaintiffs believe to be the deficiencies in the production that has occurred to date?

MR. SLATER: That's a good question. I would like to think we can do so very quickly but because of the tenor of this discussion and some of the representations that have been made and how the issues have expanded somewhat into a formal motion to compel, I would want to try to be more comprehensive than we are in the letters, and I think that's what Your Honor is expecting, so I would say that we would probably need two weeks. And I'm trying to take into account when the July 4th

holiday is, but I would like to think that we could do it by
July 9th, at the latest. And if we can do it faster, we'll
certainly let counsel know and let Your Honor know and, you
know, we can perhaps adjust when we're going to serve it. But
I would like to, if you can indulge us, to July 9th. Again,
we'll try do it quicker. There's probably several people on
this call on my team right now saying we can get it out by the
end of today. But if we can get it done quicker, perhaps if
Your Honor can set what the response time will be triggered by
when we serve it, then if we serve it July 6th, it would be
whatever amount of days you give the defense from there. If we
serve it July 9th, it would be from there. Is that acceptable?

JUDGE VANASKIE: Let me ask Ms. Priselac.

MS. PRISELAC: Sure. Your Honor, I'd just point out, too, that I don't believe it will be a massive amount of documents, but we did note in our letter that we are doing an ongoing QC process and we expect that to be done by July 2nd. So given that the plaintiffs have already written several deficiency letters about fully reviewing the production, we think it makes sense that they should fully review the production before they write some type of motion to compel or deficiency letter.

JUDGE VANASKIE: I want to get this matter moving so we are not going to wait until your production is complete to start the clock running for the production -- preparation of

2.4

that motion. But I will give the plaintiffs until July 9th to present a comprehensive motion. If it needs to be supplemented based upon what occurs after the motion has been submitted, certainly it can be. And I will give ZHP, to be fair, two weeks to respond.

MS. PRISELAC: Thank you, Your Honor.

JUDGE VANASKIE: That takes us all the way to the 23rd of July, which bothers me. But you will get two weeks, not until the 23rd. And so, Mr. Slater, if you prepare your motion and have it filed sooner, the two-week clock for a response will start running. And after I see the motion, even before I receive the response, I will look at the calendar and schedule a hearing via Zoom so we can get this matter resolved.

Substantial production has been made and so I'm encouraged by that. I know that plaintiffs continue to raise concerns with respect to the completeness of that production, and certainly it's detailed in their agenda letter, and I would expect that would be part of any motion that is presented. If the motion is presented and then a production occurs that moots some of the motion, that would be great. But in the meantime, let's get this matter moving.

So, plaintiffs, you have a hard deadline of July 9th for the presentation of that motion. ZHP defendants, you have a hard deadline of two weeks from the filing of that motion. If it's filed sooner than that, your two-week clock is running.

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

```
And, as I said, we will conduct a hearing on this matter most
likely via Zoom. I'm toying with the idea of an in-person
hearing but I'm not sure we're there yet, and I would have to
check with the Clerk of the Court and Judge Kugler about doing
an in-person hearing on this matter. But I think that's all we
can accomplish on the question of ZHP's production at this
point.
       Is there anything else, Mr. Slater, you wanted to raise
on that issue?
         MR. SLATER: Yes, Your Honor. I think Ms. Priselac
agreed moments ago, the one thing that we would like to get
resolved, frankly, as we said in our letter, by today, because
of our impending deadline for our expert reports, is concrete
confirmation from ZHP as to the testing results as requested in
our letter. And I think Ms. Priselac said they can get that to
us today. So that, from our perspective, is the most intensely
pressing matter. So if that can be produced today, that would
be very helpful.
         JUDGE VANASKIE: All right.
         MS. PRISELAC: Your Honor, that's not what I said.
         JUDGE VANASKIE: All right. What --
         MS. PRISELAC: That's not what I said.
         JUDGE VANASKIE: What did you say?
         MS. PRISELAC: So thank you.
       Your Honor, we have told the plaintiffs, starting back
```

2.4

in August of 2020, that the nitrosamine testing results were all produced in a prioritized manner, because the plaintiffs told us they needed them as soon as possible, in a production that's labeled ZHP17. Every single nitrosamine testing record related to valsartan API that is USDMF grade, which means it can be sold in a United States product, has been produced to the plaintiffs and has been in their possession since August.

As part of the meet-and-confer process, what they asked us is that -- after they saw a summary of nitrosamine testing results that included testing results for valsartan product that is not USDMF grade, they asked us if we could produce additional documents that would summarize those testing results. We said we would ask the client if such a document exists, and if it does, we would produce it.

We went back to the client, the client looked. The most detailed summary of all nitrosamine testing results, including products that weren't sold in the United States, the most detailed summary they have is the one that the plaintiffs already have and have referenced numerous times.

The issue, in terms of the underlying nitrosamine testing records, was an issue that we were in constant communication with plaintiffs last year when they asked us to prioritize these documents. We made it clear that these testing documents and batch records would relate solely to USDMF-grade API, all of those documents were produced between

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

August and November of last year. They're clearly marked as such on our production log so there's no argument that they should be difficult to find. Literally, the documents Mr. Slater is talking about are titled in the production log "Nitrosamine Testing Results", so I don't understand what the current request now is. JUDGE VANASKIE: All right. Mr. Slater? MR. SLATER: Thank you, Your Honor. First of all, there's a statement in ZHP's documents that they tested 7,000 batches of valsartan, and we have asked repeatedly where are those test results for the 7,000 batches, and ZHP has given us Bates ranges that are not just specific test results, they're much broader, and we said just tell us the specific Bates numbers of the specific documents that contain those 7,000 test results for the batches. That's number one. And I thought they were going to agree to do it, and I thought they agreed the other day to do it, so this is backtracking.

Secondly, Ms. Priselac keeps referring to USDMF-grade valsartan. That argument that ZHP would only have to produce the results for the valsartan that was, quote, unquote, USDMF grade was rejected by Judge Schneider. He said, no, you're producing the test results for all of the valsartan manufactured in the facilities that manufactured valsartan to go to the United States because, obviously, it was all

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

manufactured with the same process and we have the right to get that relevant information.

30200

What we said on the phone the other day was, look, the last thing that either side wants, because there's, obviously, not clarity from the testimony and what we've been told in the meet and confers, from our perspective, has changed. We don't need to, at this point, have Your Honor resolve who said what, when, what we want to do is get final closure on this issue. So what we said was, identify for us please Bates numbers of the actual documents that you state are all of the test results, number one; and number two, please identify, within those documents, which of those test results relate to batches that were utilized to manufacture the valsartan that was sold by ZHP through its independent -- through its wholly owned distributor, Solco, in the United States, and also those batches that were used to supply Teva and Torrent, the finished dose manufacturers who purchased the API from ZHP to manufacture finished dose that they also sold in the U.S. way there's going to be no ambiguity, we're not going to have any questions later on about whether or not the specific batches that should have -- that should have been focused on were, we have clarity and we have agreement, because ZHP tells us these are those specific Bates numbers of those specific They clearly have that information, it's something that we can't get clarity on, and we think we should put this to bed

```
1
    with that relief, please.
 2
             MS. PRISELAC: Your Honor, may I respond?
 3
             JUDGE VANASKIE: Yes. Then I'll have a question or
 4
    two of you, Ms. Priselac, but go ahead.
 5
             MS. PRISELAC: Sure. So the first thing, when we're
 6
    talking about this Macro Discovery Order, and it's cited in
 7
    plaintiffs' submission, when viewing documents, certainly the
 8
    ZHP parties did tag responses and produce to the other side
 9
    discussions about nitrosamine impurities wherever the impurity
10
    was, whether it was a USDMF-grade valsartan or if it was
11
    related to, you know, another country's valsartan API.
12
    understand Judge Schneider's ruling on that front. But if you
13
    look at that order, there's a whole section about testing and
14
    it talks about meet and confers with the parties, about what
15
    specific sets of testing would be produced. And that's because
16
    in these companies there's a huge amount of testing data that
17
    exists, and it's extremely -- in ZHP's case, it's all kept in
18
    hard copy. And much of last summer, from our side, was spent
19
    negotiating with the plaintiffs what hard copy testing
20
    documents would and would not be produced, because it was a
21
    huge undertaking by our client.
22
           In the end, what we have agreed was that it would be
23
    USDMF-grade valsartan API batch records and the related
2.4
    nitrosamine testing results.
25
           That has all been produced, it is all clearly marked for
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the plaintiffs. This idea that it isn't, I don't know what else we could possibly tell them, Your Honor. I couldn't -these actual testing records are more clearly identified than any other set of documents in our production log, which I'm happy to share with Your Honor if you would like.

So in terms of -- they've had all of the nitrosamine testing records, I'm looking at the log right now, since the last thing that we made a replacement with production in September. I have correspondence from plaintiffs' counsel where they ask is this production complete; we confirm, yes, it is, in September of 2020; and we've heard nothing about this ever since.

So this idea now that somehow we should go back and manually scan thousands of more documents that relate to a product that was never sold in the United States is just flabbergasting. They've made no showing about why it would be relevant or proportional in terms of this case.

Related to matching up these testing results to, you know, certain products that were sold in the United States, Your Honor, this is probably the tenth attempt of the plaintiffs to try to get the defendants to map out the entire supply chain for them. Judge Schneider repeatedly rejected that, in part because it's almost impossible for the API manufacturers to do. And part of the -- my understanding is part of the reason we're doing the defendant fact sheets is so

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MR. SLATER:

that the supply chain is counted for through that process, not through some process where ZHP is going to stipulate what API ended up in what finished dose product. That was never contemplated by Judge Schneider. JUDGE VANASKIE: All right. There's a lot here that needs to be unpacked somewhat. First, Mr. Slater, was there an agreement to limit testing results to the USDMF-grade valsartan? MR. SLATER: Not that I'm aware of. I argued the issue with Judge Schneider and he ruled against ZHP and said they are not going to be able to limit their production of test results to DMF. So I'm not sure what agreement counsel's talking about or what issue is being raised. It's confusing to me. Again, there's a reference in ZHP's documents that were shared with the regulatory authorities after the revelation of the nitrosamines that 7,000 batches were tested. When we first raised this, Your Honor, ZHP said, we're working on trying to identify what that testing was. They seemed to be acting in good faith to try to find the test results, so it's not as if this is a new request. We referenced this previously in hearings with Your Honor. JUDGE VANASKIE: Yes, if I can recall --

easily tell Your Honor the Bates ranges, then they can easily

I appreciate it. And if counsel can so

2.4

confirm it for us and then that would be binding. That's all we're asking for.

JUDGE VANASKIE: So I'm having -- I'm getting confused here, Ms. Priselac, because I thought I heard you say that, oh, about a year ago there was an agreement that would limit testing results to USDMF-grade valsartan. Did I hear that incorrectly?

MS. PRISELAC: You did not.

JUDGE VANASKIE: And where is that agreement memorialized?

MS. PRISELAC: That agreement was made between my former colleague, Joe Ferretti, and Mr. Parekh. Mr. Slater and his office had no involvement whatsoever in those negotiations or the production. And I do still have Mr. Ferretti's email, and I can forward to Your Honor the email where he makes clear that our production was done as of September on all of these issues, and we've heard nothing from the plaintiffs ever since.

With respect to what we agreed to do, as part of the meet-and-confer process, I certainly agreed to go back to see if there was a summary of these 7,000 test results, rather than producing the tens of thousands of paper documents, that would be extremely burdensome, so that perhaps we could give that to the plaintiffs. And after a search, the only summary that the client has in its possession that it keeps in the ordinary course is the summary that the plaintiffs already have. So I

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

```
was willing to go back to find a way to try to get this
information in a way, Your Honor, to resolve this issue that
would not be unduly burdensome for my client, but there isn't.
These are all test results that exist in paper form; and
there's no summary spreadsheet other than the summary
spreadsheet the plaintiffs already have.
         JUDGE VANASKIE: And has that been identified by Bates
number, that summary --
         MS. PRISELAC: Yes.
         JUDGE VANASKIE: -- spreadsheet?
      Mr. Slater, what was your request?
         MR. SLATER: I'm asking that ZHP -- the imminent
relief is to identify, so that there's no question, there's no
confusion and there's no disconnect, which Bates numbers, what
the Bates numbers for the documents that have the test results
for the valsartan testing that was produced, that's number one;
and to the extent that they can, which I assume they can, we're
not asking for the whole supply chain, we're not asking what
went to the downstream distributors and we're not asking what
went to the retailers, we're asking which Bates numbers also
show or documents show which of the API was sold through Solco,
was sold to Torrent, was sold to Teva, for sale in the United
States, that's all.
       The other issue --
         JUDGE VANASKIE: Well, one at a time.
```

```
1
             MR. SLATER: -- we can address in our motion to
 2
    compel, as necessary.
 3
             JUDGE VANASKIE: All right.
 4
             MS. PRISELAC: So --
 5
             JUDGE VANASKIE: Let me go back to your first point,
 6
    and then I'll hear from you, Ms. Priselac.
 7
           You're asking for an identification by Bates number for
 8
    the testing of the 7,000 batches?
 9
             MR. SLATER: For the test results, Your Honor, yes.
10
             JUDGE VANASKIE: Okay. Ms. Priselac, what would be --
11
    can that be produced?
12
             MS. PRISELAC: So, sure, Your Honor. Just to clarify,
13
    and I sent this information to Mr. Slater previously, the
14
    testing results -- when we are talking about the 7,000 batch
15
    testing results, not all of those batches are USDMF grade. And
16
    so what they have and what we have produced are all of the
17
    testing results for USDMF-grade valsartan API, and those are at
18
    ZHP17 is the volume number of the production. I'm happy to
19
    re-send those specific Bates ranges to Mr. Slater or state them
20
    on the record. I can read them now, if you would like.
21
             JUDGE VANASKIE: Yes, why don't you read them now.
22
             MS. PRISELAC: Sure, it's ZHP00117716 to ZH00120312.
23
             JUDGE VANASKIE: Okay. And now, as I understand what
2.4
    you're saying, the 7,000 batches that were tested, some were
25
    non-USDMF-grade valsartan; is that correct?
```

```
1
             MS. PRISELAC: That's correct, Your Honor.
 2
             JUDGE VANASKIE: And the test results for the
 3
    non-USDMF-grade batches have not been produced?
 4
             MS. PRISELAC: That's correct, Your Honor.
 5
             JUDGE VANASKIE: And they have not been produced
 6
    because you reached an agreement with Mr. Parekh?
 7
             MS. PRISELAC: Well, I think there are two things,
 8
    Your Honor.
 9
           I would say that first, the provision that the
10
    plaintiffs have cited about non-USDMF-grade-related documents,
11
    we do believe we fulfilled that in the sense that if there are
12
    responsive documents talking about nitrosamine and
13
    non-USDMF-grade valsartan, it was still produced to the
14
    plaintiff; and we have several examples of that.
15
           The Macro Discovery Order has a different section about
16
    testing results. Our position was that those testing results
17
    all should relate to USDMF-grade valsartan. And in our
18
    discussions last summer with Mr. Parekh, we made it clear that
19
    that is what we were willing to produce, there was no
20
    objection, and that's how the parties proceeded for almost a
21
    year now. There has been no -- there has been no ambiguity
22
    about what was being produced and what was not being produced.
23
    And if we do have -- if this is going to be part of the hearing
2.4
    that we ultimately have, Your Honor, I'm happy to bring that
25
    correspondence between Mr. Ferretti and Mr. Parekh.
```

```
1
             JUDGE VANASKIE: Mr. Slater?
 2
             MR. SLATER: I think at this point we're going to have
 3
    to look at that Bates range. I -- obviously it's about 3,000
    pages long. I'm concerned that it may be -- or 25, about 2,700
    pages, it looks like. I'm concerned that that may be broader
 6
    than -- it may just be an entire collection. But if that's
 7
    just the test results, we'll take a look at that and we'll
 8
    compare it to what we had before and see if it's the documents
 9
    that we've been told previously were the right documents that
10
    we utilized in depositions.
11
           As far as the underlying testing for the non-USDMF
12
    grade, we'll make a decision on whether to move on that --
13
             JUDGE VANASKIE: All right.
14
             MR. SLATER: -- so Your Honor doesn't have to resolve
15
    that today.
16
           As far as identifying which was sold through Solco
17
    versus Teva and Torrent, that may also have to become a subject
18
    of the motion. I don't know that that has to be something we
19
    have to fight for today. So I'm trying to do this in an
20
    orderly way for Your Honor.
21
             JUDGE VANASKIE: Thank you for that.
22
           You will have to raise those issues, if you are going to
23
    raise them, in this motion.
2.4
             MR. SLATER: Will due.
25
             JUDGE VANASKIE: The deadline for which is July 9.
```

```
1
    All right?
 2
           Is there anything else dealing with the ZHP production,
 3
    from the plaintiffs' perspective?
 4
             MR. SLATER: Nothing on the ZHP issues, Your Honor.
 5
             JUDGE VANASKIE:
                             Anything else from ZHP, Ms. Priselac?
 6
             MS. PRISELAC: Nothing. Thank you, Your Honor.
 7
             JUDGE VANASKIE: All right. Thank you.
 8
           Camille, how are you holding up?
 9
             THE COURT REPORTER: I'm fine, Your Honor. Thank you.
10
             JUDGE VANASKIE: All right. Let's proceed then to the
11
    next item which deals with Hetero production and its privilege
12
    loq.
13
           Is there anything ripe to be addressed with respect to
14
    this matter covered at Page 8 of the plaintiffs' agenda letter
15
    and Pages 3 -- Page 3 of the defendants' agenda letter? Let me
16
    ask of plaintiffs, who will be addressing this?
17
             MR. SLATER: Your Honor, I thought that Mr. Parekh
18
            I'm hoping he's on mute.
    would.
19
             JUDGE VANASKIE: Yes, I'm expecting that's the issue.
20
           Mr. Parekh, are you there?
21
           (No response).
22
             JUDGE VANASKIE: Apparently not.
23
                         I quess, unless somebody else wants to
             MR. SLATER:
2.4
    jump in, I can pinch hit to say that I don't think that there's
25
    anything for Your Honor to resolve today. I think that from
```

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
the exchange and from my discussions with our team, there's
going to be sort of a final determination in the meet and
confer as to what disputes remain and then I suppose at that
point we'd be ready to submit them. I don't disagree with
that.
         JUDGE VANASKIE: Okay. Mr. Nakul, are you there?
         MR. SHAH: Yes, Your Honor, this is Nakul Shah for
Hetero Drugs.
         JUDGE VANASKIE: Yes, Mr. Shah, I'm sorry, yes.
       Mr. Shah, I know Mr. Abraham was not available today,
unless something changed. So will you be addressing --
         MR. SHAH: That's correct, Your Honor.
         JUDGE VANASKIE: Okay.
         MR. SHAH: Yes, Your Honor, Mr. Abraham is on trial
currently.
         JUDGE VANASKIE: Right. Is there anything to address
from Hetero's perspective?
         MR. SHAH: No, Your Honor, I don't believe that this
issue is currently ripe for a judicial intervention. We have
previously made de-designations of privileged documents to
plaintiff. We additionally met and conferred with plaintiffs a
couple of days ago, on June 22nd, and discussed that we would
be making a subsequent production of de-designated privileged
documents. And we essentially reached an understanding that we
would meet and confer again at that point to determine what the
```

```
1
    universe of contested documents are and determine what, if any,
 2
    issues should be addressed by Your Honor. But at this time
 3
    nothing is ripe to be addressed, Your Honor.
 4
             JUDGE VANASKIE: All right. Very well.
                                                      Thank you.
 5
           The next issue I wanted to address, then, would be the
 6
    question of the defendants' in-person appearance at plaintiffs'
 7
    depositions. This was raised at Pages 8 and 9 of the
 8
    plaintiffs' agenda letter. I don't think it was addressed in
 9
    the defendants' agenda letter.
10
           So who will be addressing this issue for the plaintiffs?
11
             MS. BOLDT: Your Honor, this is Paige Boldt for the
12
    plaintiffs. I believe this isn't ripe for discussion for
13
    today.
            I think it was discussed including it in the agendas
14
    but we have not had a chance to meet and confer as a leadership
15
    to discuss the issues there. So we're hopeful we can resolve
16
    these very case-specific evaluations for safety without court
17
    intervention.
18
             JUDGE VANASKIE: All right. Very well.
19
             MS. LOCKARD: Your Honor, excuse me, if I may.
20
             JUDGE VANASKIE: Go ahead.
21
             MS. LOCKARD: It's Victoria Lockard on behalf of the
22
    defendants from Greenberg Traurig.
23
           Just by way of background on this, it was not included
2.4
    in the defendants' submission. The reason is that defendants'
25
    included it in the initial exchange of agenda points with
```

2.4

2.5

plaintiffs' counsel. Early yesterday morning, Ms. Boldt emailed me to say that she felt it wasn't ripe because we needed more meet and confer time on it. At that point I was honest and said, okay, I'd like to propose a meet and confer for this afternoon; we'll take it off our submission. I didn't get a response. I responded again and said, please let me know when you can speak; I didn't get a response. So we took it out of our submission and were surprised to see that plaintiffs then did include a write-up of this.

I am happy to continue to meet and confer but I will say this: We have plaintiffs' depositions that are going forward the first week of July. We need to get some resolution on these issues. We're happy to work with plaintiffs' counsel where there are particular plaintiffs who cannot or will not be able to sit in person for depositions. But the growing issue is that, you know, as the COVID concern starts to wane, people get vaccinated, you know, the COVID protocols in the protective order need to start being loosened. And what we are finding in some cases is that plaintiffs -- sometimes two or more plaintiffs' attorneys are showing up in person at the plaintiffs' deposition, but defendants are being told it's not safe for them to attend, not even one single lawyer who's vaccinated.

So I do think this is going to be an issue that we will not be able to work out in total. I'm willing to continue to

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

```
resolve it, but if we are not able, then I would just flag for
the Court we may be coming back to you next week, if you were
inclined to speak with us in between, because I don't think
this issue can wait until July 14th, which is when we have the
next CMC.
         JUDGE VANASKIE: All right. Yes. I certainly will
make myself available next week if it needs to be resolved, if
you are all unable to resolve it among yourselves.
       I will give you a heads up that we might have to conduct
that conference call or Zoom session after 5 p.m. as I have a
hearing next week; but we will address it so the matter can
continue to move on.
       So what I will do is wait to hear from you all in terms
of the need to have intervention, the Court's intervention, on
this matter. Hopefully, you will be able to work it out.
       And you are right, Ms. Lockard, to raise the question of
whether the COVID protocols need to be re-examined at this
point. Perhaps we're getting to that stage of recovery here in
the country. But for now, I'll wait to hear from you.
         MS. LOCKARD:
                       Thank you, Judge.
         MS. BOLDT:
                    Thank you, Your Honor.
         JUDGE VANASKIE:
                         Thank you.
       The next issue I have is the treater physician protocol.
Is this ripe for discussion today?
```

MR. NIGH: Yes, Your Honor. This is Daniel Nigh on

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

2.5

```
behalf of plaintiffs. I do believe this is an issue that's
ripe to discuss today. Although I do believe that this is an
issue that we've been addressing with Judge Kugler and should
continue to address with Judge Kugler.
         JUDGE VANASKIE: All right. That's fine.
noticed in the defense agenda letter, this came after the
plaintiffs' fact sheet presentation. So we will let you raise
this issue with Judge Kugler. And the other issue is the
bellwether pool. That, of course, is for Judge Kugler as well.
       Is there anything else that we need to discuss today
with respect to discovery issues?
         MR. SLATER: Nothing from plaintiffs, Your Honor.
         MR. GOLDBERG: Nothing from defendants, Your Honor.
         JUDGE VANASKIE: All right. Thank you, Mr. Goldberg.
                  So what we will do then is I will drop off
       All right.
this call, I'll call Judge Kugler, and we'll all rejoin this
call after I am able to contact Judge Kugler and we will
continue the conference with Judge Kugler. All right. Thank
you all very much.
         MR. SLATER: Your Honor, should we hold on and wait?
         JUDGE VANASKIE: Yes, I think that's how we have done
this in the past.
         MR. SLATER: Yes, that's how we've done it.
                                                     When you
said rejoin, I just was wondering if you were suggesting we
call back but we will wait on the line.
```

```
1
             JUDGE VANASKIE: Yes, I will be rejoining.
 2
             MR. SLATER: Okay. Thank you.
 3
             JUDGE VANASKIE: Okay. Bye-bye.
 4
             (Brief recess taken at 11:24 a.m.)
 5
             MS. SMITH: Judge Vanaskie, this is Loretta. Judge
 6
    Kugler said it will take him a few minutes, three or four
 7
    minutes, to get into the call.
 8
             JUDGE VANASKIE: Thank you, Loretta, for letting us
 9
           Thank you.
    know.
10
             JUDGE KUGLER: Good morning. It's Judge Kugler.
                                                               How
11
    is everybody?
12
             MR. SLATER: Hello, Judge. Doing well. How are you?
13
             JUDGE KUGLER: We have a court reporter on today, I
14
    assume?
15
             THE COURT REPORTER: Good morning, Judge. It's
16
    Camille.
17
             JUDGE KUGLER: Hello, Camille. How are you?
18
             THE COURT REPORTER: I'm well, thank you. How are
19
    you?
20
             JUDGE KUGLER: I am fine, thank you.
21
           Well, it doesn't look like there's a lot on the agenda
22
    for me, so we'll get to the orders to show cause in just a
23
    second but I wanted to bring you up to date as to where we are
2.4
    in court.
25
           I tried a jury trial last week. I'm scheduled to pick
```

2.4

another jury on Thursday and then I'm starting another jury trial on July 12th. So we are starting jury trials in Camden and New Jersey District courthouses. We are actually doing civil motions also in the courtrooms now, not civil trials if there is a criminal trial going on because we are only doing one jury trial per courthouse because of the logistics of moving all the jurors around and keeping everybody spaced. I anticipate after Labor Day we will be open fully as if there was no pandemic, but that depends on the numbers.

As to our judicial vacancies in the District of New Jersey, we have six, the president has nominated four, two have been confirmed, the third one had her judiciary committee hearing this week, the fourth one will have her judiciary committee hearing right after the 4th of July. So we're making progress towards restoring some normalcy in the District of New Jersey.

So, anyway, orders to show cause, there were three returnable, but I understand that Wilcox could be dismissed because that's been resolved, correct?

MR. HARKINS: Yes, Your Honor. This is Steve Harkins with Greenberg Traurig for the Teva defendants and joint defense group.

The Wilcox matter has been resolved and the order to show cause can be withdrawn. Defendants do request and move for dismissal of the remaining cases, Knox and Sundermeir.

```
1
             JUDGE VANASKIE: Any objection to Knox and Sundermeir?
 2
             MR. NIGH: Your Honor, this is Daniel Nigh
 3
    representing Sundermeir. No objection on that one.
 4
             JUDGE KUGLER: All right. Sundermeir will be
 5
    dismissed.
 6
           How about Knox, anybody want to speak on Knox?
 7
             MS. BOLDT: Your Honor, this is Paige Boldt for Knox,
 8
    plaintiff, and no objection, Your Honor.
 9
             JUDGE KUGLER: Okav. That will be dismissed.
10
           Now, there's three you've requested an order to show
11
    cause, DeClerk, Stone and Stewart. Any issues with those?
12
             MR. HARKINS: Your Honor, for the defense group, we
13
    have no updates so we do request orders to show cause in the
14
    DeClerk, Stone and Stewart returnable at the July case
15
    management conference.
16
             JUDGE KUGLER: Okay.
17
             MR. SCHWARTZ: Your Honor, this is Robert Schwartz.
18
    May I be heard on DeClerk?
19
             JUDGE KUGLER: Sure.
20
             MR. SCHWARTZ: I checked this morning on the status of
21
    that and it was being finished and it should have been filed or
22
    served already. I sent an email this morning to Mr. Cotes
23
    advising that as per the notice that we received about this
2.4
    call, so I don't think that's going to be an issue. I know
25
    it's not going to be an issue and certainly not subject to an
```

```
1
    order to show cause.
 2
             JUDGE KUGLER: Well, you have a month to get it
 3
    resolved until the July hearing anyway. So if by the time of
 4
    the July hearing it's resolved, then it will not be dismissed.
    It will be withdrawn.
 6
             MR. SCHWARTZ: I just wanted to bring you up to date
 7
    on that, Judge. Thank you.
 8
             JUDGE KUGLER: Thank you. I appreciate it.
 9
           Anybody else on these?
10
           (No response).
11
             JUDGE KUGLER: All right. We'll shift those to orders
12
    to show cause returnable at the July meeting.
13
           And there is one, two, three, four, five, Debbie Aloian,
14
    A-L-O-I-A-N, Cassandra Henton, Gloria Knight, Worikeena
15
    Righteous and Bryant Brooks, have been listed and you're
16
    seeking to shift it to another listing. Any updates on any of
17
    those?
18
             MR. HARKINS: Your Honor, for the defense, the one
19
    update is the Brooks case has been resolved and that can be
20
    moved off. We do -- we will continue to list the other four
21
    cases.
22
             JUDGE KUGLER: Okay. We will list the other four for
23
    another listing next month.
2.4
           Okay. Anything else that you need my assistance with
25
    today?
```

```
1
           (No response).
 2
             JUDGE KUGLER: Okay.
 3
             MS. LOCKARD: Your Honor, it's Victoria Lockard from
 4
    Greenberg Traurig for the defendants.
 5
           There is one additional item that the parties believed
 6
    that was appropriate for Your Honor to address, which is the --
 7
             JUDGE KUGLER: I'm sorry, you're breaking up something
 8
    terrible. I can't hear anything you're saying.
 9
             MS. LOCKARD: Okay. Let me try again. I wasn't
10
    moving around.
11
           Victoria Lockard, Greenberg Traurig, for the defendants
12
    and the joint defense group.
13
           Your Honor, the last issue relates to the treater
14
    deposition protocol and both parties have met and conferred on
15
    this and there are some remaining disputes. Plaintiffs and
16
    defendants both included a submission in their materials on
17
    this issue, and so we addressed it briefly with Judge Vanaskie
18
    and I think the parties were in agreement that this is
19
    something that is appropriate for you to address.
20
             MR. NIGH: Your Honor, this is Daniel Nigh for the
21
    plaintiffs. We agree that this is ripe to be addressed by Your
22
    Honor.
23
           This is Daniel Nigh for the plaintiffs.
                                                    I'm still here.
2.4
    I am not sure if Judge Kugler is still here.
25
             JUDGE VANASKIE: This is Tom Vanaskie. I am not sure
```

```
1
    if Judge Kugler is still here.
 2
           Loretta, are you there?
 3
             MS. SMITH: Yes, Judge. I am going to text Judge
 4
    Kugler right now.
 5
             JUDGE VANASKIE: Okay. Thank you.
 6
             JUDGE KUGLER: Hi, it's Judge Kugler.
                                                    I'm sorry, I
 7
    lost the signal.
 8
           So anyway. Someone was speaking. Ms. Lockard?
 9
             MS. LOCKARD: Oh, yes, Judge. I don't know if you
10
    heard any part of what I said, but, essentially, the remaining
11
    issue is the parties are negotiating a treating physician
12
    deposition protocol and there are some issues that we've been
13
    unable to agree on with respect to the treaters.
14
             JUDGE KUGLER:
                           Okay.
15
             MS. LOCKARD:
                           So --
16
             MR. NIGH: Your Honor, this is Daniel Nigh for the
17
    plaintiffs. We agree that this issue is ripe for Your Honor to
18
    address today.
19
             JUDGE KUGLER: Okay. I'm listening.
                                                   I mean, I read
20
    the letters, but go ahead.
21
             MS. LOCKARD: Sure. I can start us off, Your Honor.
22
           So there are a few disputes remaining. The key dispute
23
    where I believe we could use Your Honor's quidance relates to
2.4
    the number of treating physician depositions that are to be
25
    taken. And in the process of negotiating the protocol for how
```

2.4

these depositions will be scheduled and conducted, plaintiffs' counsel have suggested in their request that the depositions be limited to two depositions, one of a prescriber and one of a treater for each of the 28 bellwether plaintiffs.

So, you know, obviously, as you read our papers, you see we disagree with that restriction, we don't find it to be necessary and, in fact, believe it will pose significant prejudice and burden to the defendants as they try to work up these cases for trial. In some cases these plaintiffs have complex medical histories, multiple prescribers, multiple treaters.

You know, for example, we have one plaintiff bellwether, Mr. Garcia, he has at least four prescribers of the valsartan at issue, he has three other treaters for hypertension who prescribed other sartan drugs, and he has at least two oncologists. So he, alone, just this one plaintiff, you know, has potentially nine treaters who could have relevant information. That's not to suggest we would necessarily need to depose all nine, but a restriction, an arbitrary restriction of two, will work an injustice, we think, on our ability to work up these cases.

Another example, Ms. Kennedy has four prescribers. She has a breast surgeon, she has three key oncologists.

So, you know, in many of these cases, it's going to be very difficult for the parties to agree on two.

Also, yesterday, in order to get the ball rolling while we worked out some of these disputes, the parties actually began to exchange some names of initial treaters for the nine plaintiffs who have been deposed. And the exercise just illustrates why the limitation on two is really unworkable and unfair because in many of these cases the parties identified different treaters and we couldn't agree even on the first two most significant treaters to be taken. In some instances we ended up with two totally different names for a total of four treaters that the litigants feel need to be taken in order to work the case up for trial.

So defendants, you know, have no interest in wasting time, resources, taking unnecessary depositions, we're all experienced counsel here, but we are talking about cases that are being worked up for potential trial; and, you know, even under Rule 30(a)(2)(A)(i), the parties are allowed to take up to ten depositions per side without leave of court. So the fact that we are in an MDL situation should not provide, you know, some excuse for severely restricting the number of depositions that we are able to take of the treaters.

If defendants are acting unreasonably or noticing, you know, peripheral third parties or treaters, then plaintiffs certainly have a remedy in the order of a protective order for seeking guidance from the Court, and we would certainly work with both sides -- you know, both sides would work together to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

make sure that we don't end up with eight or ten treater depositions. But to have an across-the-board arbitrary number applicable to every plaintiff we just think is unworkable. think we could initiate the process, work together, try to identify really the key treaters, get those depositions scheduled, and then if there is a dispute down the road, you know, we can come back to the Court on that and address those on a plaintiff-by-plaintiff basis.

The last thing I'll say on this point is, you know, plaintiffs made reference in their paper in Benicar there was a limitation that was imposed, and, you know, we -- these defendants were not in Benicar. I don't know the intent behind that, but I will say we've been in a number of -- both plaintiffs and defendants have been in a number of other MDLs where there were no restrictions, where the parties worked together as experienced counsel to take the depositions that were needed, and I think that we can certainly do that here. mean, I could cite to you a number of MDLs where there were no limitations. It really is the exception to have a limitation on treaters rather than the rule. But without going through each of those MDLs, I'll just say, you know, if we do need to have some sort of limit imposed, I think that the federal rules, you know, provide that ten -- ten-deposition limit per side and I think that's what should be imposed, if anything.

So I'll stop there and let counsel, Mr. Nigh, respond on

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

```
that point. There are some other issues that I think are maybe
less significant to the parties but which also need to be
worked out, but I think this is really the key dispute we need
to hear from Your Honor on.
         JUDGE KUGLER: Well, before we turn to Mr. Nigh,
presumably there is some method by which you are identifying
those physicians you want to depose, correct?
         MS. LOCKARD: Correct.
         JUDGE KUGLER: And that's probably based on the
records that you have and plaintiffs' fact statements, correct?
         MS. LOCKARD:
                       That's correct, they are coming from the
physicians who were identified in the fact sheets and then we
are collecting those records.
         JUDGE KUGLER: So you have a pretty good idea as to
who the more important or most important physicians are for
each of these plaintiffs; isn't that right?
         MS. LOCKARD: I think that's fair, yes.
         JUDGE KUGLER: So, why can't we start with two
depositions, a prescriber and a treater, and then if you
believe, and you might, it's perfectly possible, I'm not
suggesting we should have an arbitrary limit of two, but if you
believe more are needed, why can't you ask plaintiffs and make
your case to the plaintiffs and if they don't agree, then I'll
do it. How about that?
        MS. LOCKARD: You know, I don't think that's
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

```
unreasonable to start with two each. And, you know, I think
the parties came to that conclusion on our own, in that, you
know, the process we went through yesterday in exchanging
names, you know, I think suggested that's a good approach, we
can start with two; but we don't want to be foreclosed or
limited and told, you know, or ordered in this treater protocol
that there shall only be two. But we're willing to start with
two and, you know, take it from there and work through it. I
agree that's a reasonable process. But we're trying to get
this protocol finalized and that's one hurdle to that because
plaintiffs want the protocol to specifically include this
arbitrary limitation.
         JUDGE KUGLER: So let's start with the two, and if you
make a showing that you need additional, and you can't work it
out promptly with the plaintiffs' counsel, then I will decide
it. Okay?
         MS. LOCKARD: Okay. And that's perfectly reasonable.
We will -- we will start with two. I understand where Your
Honor's coming from. I just want to make clear for the Court
that we've already identified plaintiffs who are going to need
and we will have a good reason for seeking more than two.
think --
         JUDGE KUGLER:
                       Okay.
                       -- it will be an unusual case that we
         MS. LOCKARD:
take two and stop.
```

```
JUDGE KUGLER: I don't doubt you have identified. See if you can work it out with plaintiffs for additional ones; and if not, then show good cause, the Court will permit you to take more than two. Okay?
```

MS. LOCKARD: I think that's fair. I think we can proceed with that understanding.

JUDGE KUGLER: All right. What other issues do you want to address today?

MS. LOCKARD: On the treating protocol, there is one additional -- or a couple additional issues. One of them relates to language that plaintiffs want included that would require the defendant companies to identify, you know, any contacts that one of their sales reps or businesspersons made with any of the thousands of treating physicians in this case. So we've got over 600 plaintiffs. If you assume each of them has four or five treating physicians, at least, at issue, we're talking about thousands of treaters out there, you know, some of who, you know, we may not even know who they are yet.

Plaintiffs want the treating protocol to require that defendants identify, provide notice, anytime one of defendants' sales reps or business operation people makes any contact with any of these thousands of physicians for any reason. And we're not talking about ex parte conversations between defendants' representatives and plaintiffs' treaters involving the issues in this case or the valsartan or the sartans.

2.4

We are talking about a scenario where, take Teva,

Teva's, you know, primarily a generic manufacturer but they are
the innovator of certain branded drugs, so they do have some
sales reps. Say a sales rep visits a treating physician in

Omaha, Nebraska, to discuss a sleep aid medication, nothing to
do with this case, nothing to do with valsartan. Under
plaintiffs' proposal, Teva would have to -- my team would have
to determine when that meeting took place, what was discussed,
who was involved, and we would have to report that to plaintiff
when it has nothing at all in the world to do with this case
and it interrupts the company's normal business operations.

You know, another scenario where this would play out is, you know, in instances where, say, a plaintiff -- excuse me, a patient, a non-plaintiff, a patient is taking, say, a sleep aid medication made by Teva. Say the patient calls Teva to say, hey, you know, I've gotten hives, hives or some side effect. Teva then, from its pharmacovigilance department, may need to follow up with that patient, maybe the physician, to talk about a report of hives from a drug that's not at issue in this litigation in Omaha. I mean, it's so tenuous that it would require us to do all of this work for a listing that has no bearing whatsoever, whatsoever, in this litigation. So we oppose that.

The remedy is when the physician is deposed, plaintiffs can certainly ask that physician, have you had any contact with

2.4

anybody from Teva for any reason, they can ask about it in the deposition. But to require us to do that legwork to try to put together reports of all of this we think is highly unreasonable, never seen it done in litigation before, and it has just no relevance to this litigation at all. It's just a wild-goose chase. So that's issue number two.

JUDGE KUGLER: Who wants to speak for the plaintiffs?

MR. NIGH: Your Honor, this is Daniel Nigh for the plaintiffs.

In our meet and confers, and really the purpose of this language -- it's language that was in the *Benicar* Treater Deposition Protocol. The purpose of this language is simply to identify -- unfortunately, there have been past litigations where sales reps have reached out to treater doctors and spoken to them about plaintiffs specifically, and in large part when we were able to uncover it in some of those cases, it was done as an attempt to gain an advantage in that case because of their relationship directly with that doctor. That's what we are seeking to have disclosed.

And so what we're asking here is if any sales rep has a conversation with a doctor that they detail specifically about one of our plaintiffs that they would have to disclose that information. I don't think that that's burdensome. I think there could be simply a letter to any of the sales reps that they could send out, simply a mass production -- or a mass

```
1
    communication that says if you have a contact with any of the
 2
    doctors about any specific plaintiffs in the litigation, then
 3
    you need to let us know. Frankly, that's what we're capturing
    here. We're not capturing some scenario where you have to log
    every single communication about every single type of issue
 6
    with any treating doctor. Very specifically, what we are
 7
    asking here is if it has to do with a plaintiff, then we want
 8
    to know the details of that communication because that can be
 9
    extremely relevant in the case.
10
             JUDGE KUGLER: So you want all contact with all
11
    employees of all defendants with all treating physicians?
12
             MR. NIGH: No, only if it has --
13
             JUDGE KUGLER: That would have to do with any
14
    plaintiff in the case.
15
             MR. NIGH: That's right, only if it has to do with the
16
    plaintiff.
17
             JUDGE KUGLER: How many plaintiffs are there
18
    currently?
19
             MR. NIGH: There's a little over 600.
20
             JUDGE KUGLER: How many treating physicians have we
21
    identified so far?
22
             MR. NIGH: From -- I mean, I would -- I would venture
23
    to say that there's an average of ten that are identified per
2.4
    case, so that could be 6,000, but there's going to be some
25
    overlap between those so I wouldn't be able to tell you the
```

```
1
    number of physicians.
 2
             JUDGE KUGLER: So you want each defendant to find out
 3
    from its employees if that employee has had any contact with
 4
    any of these 6,000 doctors about any of the 600 plaintiffs?
 5
             MR. NIGH:
                        That's right. I mean, that's something
 6
    that should -- that we would be entitled to anyways in terms of
 7
    discovery that's in a DFS.
 8
             JUDGE KUGLER: Well, I mean, you can ask the doctors
 9
    when you depose them, right?
10
             MR. NIGH: We could.
11
             JUDGE KUGLER: Isn't that a much easier way to do it?
12
             MR. NIGH: I mean, you know, in terms of if -- if
13
    there's not going to be any advance -- I hear some other noise
14
    on the line here.
15
           Can counsel mute? Okay.
16
           If there's -- if there's not going to be -- you know,
17
    the other -- the other reason this comes up is because of the
18
    tit for tat where the defendants are looking to also have us
19
    log our communications with treating physicians, and so in
20
    response I think that this is one of the pieces of language
21
    that was put in there that if you're going to be asking us to
22
    log our communications and send letters beforehand, then we
23
    should be able to have the same response from your employees
2.4
    who have direct contact with those doctors.
25
           So if the -- if the response is, you know, you can just
```

```
1
    depose the doctor, well, I think that that's a fair compromise
    the other direction, that if we had a conversation with the
 3
    doctor, that they can just depose the doctor for that
 4
    information as well.
 5
             JUDGE KUGLER: Sounds like a good idea.
                                                       I don't even
 6
    know how these letters -- how they'd even send these letters
 7
    out to all the employees because they would have to list
 8
    somewhere the 6,000 doctors and the 600 plaintiffs and you
 9
    would have to send a book to every one of their employees.
                                                                 So
10
    that isn't going to work.
11
           Ask the doctors if they've had any contact with any
12
    salespeople of any of the defendants about the patient and we
13
    will go from there. Okay?
14
             MR. NIGH: Yes, Your Honor.
15
             JUDGE KUGLER: All right. What's next?
16
             MS. LOCKARD:
                           So, Your Honor, Victoria Lockard again.
17
    The tit for tat issue that I think Mr. Nigh's referencing I
18
    don't see on parallel at all. And I know we've moved past the
19
    issue regarding defendants' contact, but our issue on
20
    plaintiffs' contact is a little bit different and what we're
21
    worried about is that, you know, we're not allowed, on the
22
    defense side, to meet with these physicians in an ex parte
23
    capacity to talk about the issues in the case or to talk about
```

plaintiffs or to show them documents. But plaintiffs' counsel

representing plaintiffs can do that and they do do that in

2.4

2.4

these MDLs in the litigation, and they meet with the doctors before the deposition and they talk about the drug and the defendants and the plaintiffs and the care, and they, in some instances, they show them documents, documents that aren't even in the medical records, company documents, public documents, FDA documents.

And so what we think is fair is that plaintiffs' counsel should have to disclose if they meet with one of these treaters to talk about the case for the purpose of prepping for a deposition and they provide documents or show documents to prepare the treater for the deposition, we think that we should be entitled to know what those documents are. And so it's not a log of communication. It's really, you know, who are you meeting with, plaintiffs' counsel, the treater, and what are you providing them? And we can ask the doctors about it at the deposition, you know, and they're willing to do that, but we need to know what the documents are that plaintiffs are providing and we should -- we ought to be able to get a copy of those in time to be able to ask about those documents at the deposition. That's what this issue number three is about.

JUDGE KUGLER: Well, I think I'm going to tell you,
Ms. Lockard, that you need to ask the doctors in the deposition
what contact they have had with plaintiffs' counsel, when it
took place, what was said, what they were shown. I think
that's the only way this is going to work.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think it's entirely too burdensome to make plaintiffs' counsel send you, which might even be work product, to be honest with you, I don't know, to send you in advance a summary of what they showed and what they spoke to these doctors about. So I'm not going to permit that.

Ask them at the deposition. If they indicate that they saw a document, you certainly can make a demand for that document if you don't already have it. I imagine you are going to have them.

Anyway, what's next?

MS. LOCKARD: You know, there are some minor issues I think that relate to questioning of scheduling and things like that. You know, I think with the larger issues being resolved, we'll probably be able to work these out.

Mr. Nigh, do you want to try to see if we can get things squared away from here or do you feel like there are issues we need to address with the Judge?

MR. NIGH: I agree. The only one that I do think that we should discuss is the winnowing of the bellwether pool. I just wanted to address that, with your Court's direction on the two depositions, and then additional with good cause, I believe that going back through your prior ruling in March, and we quoted that language where you wanted to see some of the doctor depositions, the plaintiff depositions, I wanted to address with the Court that we've gone through now, of the

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

30234

first ten plaintiff depositions that were to be taken before

June 1st, we now have nine of those depositions, they were

taken. There was only one that hasn't been taken yet because

the plaintiff contracted COVID; and like many cancer patients,

when they contract COVID, they usually have more complications

as did this client.

So, basically, at this point, I mean, we're seeing progress that plaintiffs are going to take these depositions, we've got many more of those 28 that have been scheduled, and we think that they're going to be taken. We don't think there's going to be a natural winnowing because of plaintiffs' depositions or because of doctor depositions. There was one statement that the defense pointed to where one of the 28 passed away and they don't have something affirmative from the family yet as to whether they are going to pursue the case. But I represent many clients in this case where they've passed away and we give the family time to grieve and usually some time thereafter they make the decision that they want to pursue I mean, the vast majority of them do. So I don't think even that is a scenario where we see any sort of natural winnowing other than it just kind of points out the need for us to try to progress these cases quickly because plaintiffs do pass away, unfortunately, they have cancer here.

But the big picture is that plaintiffs are motivated to, you know, have their case heard, I mean, they're motivated to

pursue, and, you know, that's -- in large part we see that that's because they have cancer, it's a serious injury, and so they're motivated in these cases.

So I think that in March we had a discussion. We had put forward a proposal to winnow the pool down from 28 to eight or ten, and Your Honor said let's revisit that issue in June so we put it back on the schedule; but I think at the same point, Your Honor was talking about let's see what happens with the plaintiff depos. I want to address Your Honor that we haven't seen any winnowing, that they're going to continue to have those taken. And then you wanted to see, you know, some of the doctors' depositions before we discussed winnowing.

Our position has been that, you know, we believe that 28 cases of pursuing the doctor depositions is just unnecessary. We will have a lot of cases where, you know, especially if the thought is to winnow cases after doctor depositions, that we're going to have a lot of cases that we take doctor depositions for really, you know, no major purpose, it could be accomplished by winnowing it before we take all those doctor depositions.

So I think in terms of -- first off, we don't want to waste those physicians' -- their resources, you know, and their time, especially at a time where we're finally getting through this COVID stage; but, in addition, we just feel like, you know, that doing 28 cases of doctor depositions just, at this

2.4

stage, you know, may not be the best use of resources either.

But we understood Your Honor's point, which was, get through some of these doctor depositions, get through the plaintiff depositions, and then come back to Your Honor to talk about winnowing.

So I think it may be a little early to talk about winnowing because we haven't had any of the doctor deposition yet, and with your Court's guidance on the two depositions per case, with defendants' ability to get additional depositions with good cause, but I did want to continue to put that out there, you know, we spoke about it in March, the defendants highlighted it in their agenda that you had already declined to winnow the agreed-upon bellwether pool. That's not what occurred. We put the quote in our agenda, which was, Your Honor wanted to come back in June and see what was the progress that we had and whether or not there was this natural winnowing, and to raise it back with Your Honor after we've had these plaintiff depositions and some of the doctor depositions.

But to the point that Victoria was speaking, the other issues in the treater deposition protocol, I do think that we can work out.

JUDGE KUGLER: Great. Just so you know, and I know you're not asking for a decision today on the winnowing, I'm not -- I'm not favorably inclined at this time to do any winnowing. I know there's a lot of work to be done, I know

```
1
    it's a lot of burden, but I don't think it's an undue burden
 2
    given the scope of this case and what it's becoming. It grows
 3
    every week, it grows almost every day, but, you know, keep at
 4
    it and don't be afraid to raise the issue again.
                                                       But at this
 5
    point let's just full speed ahead. Okay?
 6
             MR. NIGH: Thank you, Your Honor.
 7
             JUDGE KUGLER: All right. Anything else?
 8
             MS. LOCKARD: Not from the defendants, Your Honor.
 9
             JUDGE KUGLER: All right. Thank you everybody. Stay
10
           I'm optimistic we will see you in the courthouse in the
11
    not-too-distant future.
                             Thank you.
12
             MR. SLATER: Thank you, Your Honor.
13
             MS. LOCKARD:
                           Thank you.
14
             JUDGE VANASKIE:
                              Thank you very much.
15
             (The proceedings concluded at 12:11 p.m.)
16
17
18
             I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
19
    from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
20
21
    /S/ Camille Pedano, CCR, RMR, CRR, CRC, RPR
    Court Reporter/Transcriber
22
23
    June 28, 2021
         Date
24
25
```

		I		T
/	30 [3] - 2:9, 27:25,	28:22, 29:7	51:21, 72:12, 72:14	apologize [1] - 11:12
<u> </u>	28:1	acceptable [1] - 31:12	agendas [1] - 47 :13	appeal [2] - 8:19,
/\$ [1] - 73:21	30(a)(2)(A)(i [1] -	accommodate[1] -	ago [9] - 16:25, 17:2,	11:16
0	58:16	7:15	17:4, 20:16, 24:12,	appearance [1] - 47:6
	30,000 [1] - 10:11	accomplish [1] - 33:6	26:17, 33:11, 40:5,	applicable [1] - 59:3
07068 [1] - 1:15	30305 [1] - 2:14	accomplished [1] -	46:22	appreciate [3] - 4:22,
08101 [1] - 1:8	316 [1] - 1:20	71:19	agree [10] - 9:20, 35:16, 55:21, 56:13,	39:24, 54:8
08540 [1] - 2:18	32502 [1] - 1:21 3333 [1] - 2:14	accordance [1] - 4:19 account [2] - 9:24,	56:17, 57:25, 58:7,	approach [1] - 61:4 appropriate [9] -
		30:25	60:23, 61:9, 69:18	17:10, 18:22, 21:9,
1	4	accusations [1] - 21:7	agreed [8] - 7:14,	21:17, 27:12, 27:13,
100 [1] - 2:3		acknowledge [1] - 9:6	13:13, 33:11, 35:17,	27:16, 55:6, 55:19
103 [1] - 1:14	4 [1] - 2:3	across-the-board [1] -	37:22, 40:18, 40:19,	April [2] - 28:14, 28:18
10:00 [2] - 1:9, 3:3	4,700 [1] - 10:14	59:2	72:13	arbitrary [4] - 57:19,
11:24 [1] - 51:4	4th [3] - 1:7, 30:25,	act[1] - 9:17	agreed-upon [1] -	59:2, 60:21, 61:12
12 [3] - 4:20, 19:20,	52:14	Actavis [2] - 2:15,	72:13	argued [1] - 39:9
20:2	5	2:16	agreement [8] - 36:22,	argument [4] - 11:16,
12:11 [1] - 73:15	_	acting [2] - 39:19,	39:7, 39:12, 40:5,	12:3, 35:2, 35:20
12th [1] - 52:2	5 [1] - 4 9:10	58:21	40:9, 40:11, 43:6,	asserted [1] - 5:1
13 [1] - 9:11 13th [1] - 6:25	_	ACTION [1] - 1:3	55:18	asserting [1] - 9:9
14th [1] - 49:4	6	actual [3] - 14:18,	ahead [7] - 5:10, 18:9,	assertions [2] - 5:14,
1500 [1] - 2:6	6,000 [3] - 65:24, 66:4,	36:10, 38:3	28:1, 37:4, 47:20, 56:20, 73:5	21:11
17th [1] - 2:9	67:8	ad [1] - 28:13	aid [2] - 63:5, 63:14	assistance[1] - 54:24
1835 [1] - 1:17	600 [5] - 1:20, 62:15,	Adam [2] - 3:22, 16:23 ADAM [1] - 1:14	aided [1] - 1:25	ASSOCIATES [1] - 2:5 assume [4] - 5:15,
19-md-02875-RBK-	65:19, 66:4, 67:8	add [1] - 11:22	allegations [8] -	41:17, 51:14, 62:15
KMW [1] - 1:4	609-774-1494 [1] -	addition [1] - 71:24	13:24, 14:1, 14:16,	assuming [1] - 11:15
19102 [1] - 2:6	1:23	additional [10] -	14:21, 15:13, 26:25,	assurance[1] - 4:22
19103 [2] - 1:18, 2:10	6th [1] - 31:10	10:16, 13:21, 34:12,	27:6, 27:17	astounding [1] - 20:4
1st [1] - 70:2	_	55:5, 61:14, 62:2,	allow [1] - 7:8	Atlanta [1] - 2:14
	7	62:10, 69:21, 72:9	allowed [2] - 58:16,	attached [1] - 17:2
2	7,000 [8] - 35:10,	additionally [1] -	67:21	attempt [3] - 24:8,
2,700 [1] - 44:4	35:11, 35:15, 39:17,	46:21	almost [3] - 38:23,	38:20, 64:17
20,000 [1] - 10:10	40:20, 42:8, 42:14,	address [22] - 4:15,	43:20, 73:3	attend [2] - 4:9, 48:22
2017 [8] - 14:4, 14:12,	42:24	5:16, 12:4, 12:6,	Aloian [1] - 54:13	attention [2] - 12:20,
15:24, 17:12, 20:2,	78257 [1] - 2:3	13:9, 17:16, 21:25,	ALOIAN [1] - 54:14	20:3
21:4, 21:23, 21:24		22:8, 42:1, 46:16,	alone [1] - 57:16	attorneys [1] - 48:20
2018 [5] - 14:14,	8	47:5, 49:11, 50:4,	ALSO [1] - 2:20	August [4] - 9:3, 34:1,
15:19, 15:21, 28:14,	8 [2] - 45:14, 47:7	55:6, 55:19, 56:18,	ambiguity [2] - 36:19, 43:21	34:7, 35:1
28:19		59:7, 62:8, 69:17, 69:20, 69:25, 71:9	amount [3] - 31:11,	authorities [1] - 39:16
2020 [2] - 34:1, 38:11	9	addressed [7] - 18:17,	31:15, 37:16	automobile [1] - 3:18 available [2] - 46:10,
2021 [2] - 1:8, 73:23	9 _[2] - 44:25, 47:7	45:13, 47:2, 47:3,	analogize [1] - 23:9	49:7
21 [1] - 2:18	9th [5] - 31:2, 31:5,	47:8, 55:17, 55:21	analysis [2] - 18:5,	average [1] - 65:23
21-day [1] - 9:9	31:12, 32:1, 32:22	addressing [6] - 11:4,	21:4	await [1] - 9:14
		J.,		amaic[i] o.ii
22nd [1] - 46:22	, ,	13:1, 45:16, 46:11,	analytical [1] - 28:15	aware [5] - 14:7,
23rd [2] - 32:7, 32:9		13:1, 45:16, 46:11, 47:10, 50:3	analytical [1] - 28:15 AND [1] - 1:10	aware [5] - 14:7, 19:11, 26:6, 26:7,
23rd [2] - 32:7, 32:9 25 [2] - 1:8, 44:4	Α		•	aware [5] - 14:7, 19:11, 26:6, 26:7, 39:9
23rd [2] - 32:7, 32:9 25 [2] - 1:8, 44:4 2500 [1] - 2:14	A a.m _[2] - 3:3, 51:4	47:10, 50:3 adequacy[1] - 21:20 adjust[1] - 31:4	AND _[1] - 1:10 ANNA _[1] - 2:23 Anna _[1] - 4:8	19:11, 26:6, 26:7,
23rd [2] - 32:7, 32:9 25 [2] - 1:8, 44:4	A a.m _[2] - 3:3, 51:4 ability _[2] - 57:20, 72:9	47:10, 50:3 adequacy[1] - 21:20 adjust[1] - 31:4 advance[2] - 66:13,	AND [1] - 1:10 ANNA [1] - 2:23 Anna [1] - 4:8 another's [1] - 7:15	19:11, 26:6, 26:7, 39:9 awhile [1] - 16:25
23rd [2] - 32:7, 32:9 25 [2] - 1:8, 44:4 2500 [1] - 2:14 27 [3] - 15:24, 21:23, 21:24	A a.m[2] - 3:3, 51:4 ability [2] - 57:20, 72:9 able [17] - 8:6, 10:12,	47:10, 50:3 adequacy[1] - 21:20 adjust[1] - 31:4 advance[2] - 66:13, 69:3	AND [1] - 1:10 ANNA [1] - 2:23 Anna [1] - 4:8 another's [1] - 7:15 anticipate [1] - 52:8	19:11, 26:6, 26:7, 39:9
23rd [2] - 32:7, 32:9 25 [2] - 1:8, 44:4 2500 [1] - 2:14 27 [3] - 15:24, 21:23, 21:24 28 [7] - 57:4, 70:9, 70:13, 71:5, 71:13,	A a.m _[2] - 3:3, 51:4 ability _[2] - 57:20, 72:9	47:10, 50:3 adequacy[1] - 21:20 adjust[1] - 31:4 advance[2] - 66:13, 69:3 advantage[1] - 64:17	AND [1] - 1:10 ANNA [1] - 2:23 Anna [1] - 4:8 another's [1] - 7:15 anticipate [1] - 52:8 Antonio [1] - 2:3	19:11, 26:6, 26:7, 39:9 awhile [1] - 16:25
23rd [2] - 32:7, 32:9 25 [2] - 1:8, 44:4 2500 [1] - 2:14 27 [3] - 15:24, 21:23, 21:24 28 [7] - 57:4, 70:9, 70:13, 71:5, 71:13, 71:25, 73:23	A a.m _[2] - 3:3, 51:4 ability _[2] - 57:20, 72:9 able _[17] - 8:6, 10:12, 11:21, 12:4, 39:11,	47:10, 50:3 adequacy[1] - 21:20 adjust[1] - 31:4 advance[2] - 66:13, 69:3 advantage[1] - 64:17 advising[1] - 53:23	AND [1] - 1:10 ANNA [1] - 2:23 Anna [1] - 4:8 another's [1] - 7:15 anticipate [1] - 52:8 Antonio [1] - 2:3 anytime [1] - 62:20	19:11, 26:6, 26:7, 39:9 awhile [1] - 16:25
23rd [2] - 32:7, 32:9 25 [2] - 1:8, 44:4 2500 [1] - 2:14 27 [3] - 15:24, 21:23, 21:24 28 [7] - 57:4, 70:9, 70:13, 71:5, 71:13, 71:25, 73:23 2900 [1] - 1:17	A a.m _[2] - 3:3, 51:4 ability _[2] - 57:20, 72:9 able _[17] - 8:6, 10:12, 11:21, 12:4, 39:11, 48:15, 48:25, 49:1,	47:10, 50:3 adequacy[1] - 21:20 adjust[1] - 31:4 advance[2] - 66:13, 69:3 advantage[1] - 64:17 advising[1] - 53:23 affiliation[1] - 11:24	AND [1] - 1:10 ANNA [1] - 2:23 Anna [1] - 4:8 another's [1] - 7:15 anticipate [1] - 52:8 Antonio [1] - 2:3 anytime [1] - 62:20 anyway [4] - 52:17,	19:11, 26:6, 26:7, 39:9 awhile [1] - 16:25 B background [1] -
23rd [2] - 32:7, 32:9 25 [2] - 1:8, 44:4 2500 [1] - 2:14 27 [3] - 15:24, 21:23, 21:24 28 [7] - 57:4, 70:9, 70:13, 71:5, 71:13, 71:25, 73:23 2900 [1] - 1:17	A a.m [2] - 3:3, 51:4 ability [2] - 57:20, 72:9 able [17] - 8:6, 10:12, 11:21, 12:4, 39:11, 48:15, 48:25, 49:1, 49:15, 50:17, 58:20,	47:10, 50:3 adequacy[1] - 21:20 adjust[1] - 31:4 advance[2] - 66:13, 69:3 advantage[1] - 64:17 advising[1] - 53:23 affiliation[1] - 11:24 afraid[1] - 73:4	AND[1] - 1:10 ANNA[1] - 2:23 Anna[1] - 4:8 another's[1] - 7:15 anticipate[1] - 52:8 Antonio[1] - 2:3 anytime[1] - 62:20 anyway[4] - 52:17, 54:3, 56:8, 69:10	19:11, 26:6, 26:7, 39:9 awhile [1] - 16:25 B background [1] - 47:23
23rd [2] - 32:7, 32:9 25 [2] - 1:8, 44:4 2500 [1] - 2:14 27 [3] - 15:24, 21:23, 21:24 28 [7] - 57:4, 70:9, 70:13, 71:5, 71:13, 71:25, 73:23 2900 [1] - 1:17 2nd [1] - 31:17	A a.m [2] - 3:3, 51:4 ability [2] - 57:20, 72:9 able [17] - 8:6, 10:12, 11:21, 12:4, 39:11, 48:15, 48:25, 49:1, 49:15, 50:17, 58:20, 64:16, 65:25, 66:23,	47:10, 50:3 adequacy[1] - 21:20 adjust[1] - 31:4 advance[2] - 66:13, 69:3 advantage[1] - 64:17 advising[1] - 53:23 affiliation[1] - 11:24 afraid[1] - 73:4 afternoon[1] - 48:5	AND[1] - 1:10 ANNA[1] - 2:23 Anna[1] - 4:8 another's[1] - 7:15 anticipate[1] - 52:8 Antonio[1] - 2:3 anytime[1] - 62:20 anyway[4] - 52:17, 54:3, 56:8, 69:10 anyways[1] - 66:6	19:11, 26:6, 26:7, 39:9 awhile [1] - 16:25 B background [1] - 47:23 backtracking [1] -
23rd [2] - 32:7, 32:9 25 [2] - 1:8, 44:4 2500 [1] - 2:14 27 [3] - 15:24, 21:23, 21:24 28 [7] - 57:4, 70:9, 70:13, 71:5, 71:13, 71:25, 73:23 2900 [1] - 1:17	A a.m [2] - 3:3, 51:4 ability [2] - 57:20, 72:9 able [17] - 8:6, 10:12, 11:21, 12:4, 39:11, 48:15, 48:25, 49:1, 49:15, 50:17, 58:20, 64:16, 65:25, 66:23, 68:18, 68:19, 69:14 above-entitled [1] - 73:19	47:10, 50:3 adequacy[1] - 21:20 adjust[1] - 31:4 advance[2] - 66:13, 69:3 advantage[1] - 64:17 advising[1] - 53:23 affiliation[1] - 11:24 afraid[1] - 73:4 afternoon[1] - 48:5 agenda[13] - 4:14,	AND[1] - 1:10 ANNA[1] - 2:23 Anna[1] - 4:8 another's[1] - 7:15 anticipate[1] - 52:8 Antonio[1] - 2:3 anytime[1] - 62:20 anyway[4] - 52:17, 54:3, 56:8, 69:10 anyways[1] - 66:6 API[10] - 14:13, 34:5,	19:11, 26:6, 26:7, 39:9 awhile [1] - 16:25 B background [1] - 47:23 backtracking [1] - 35:18
23rd [2] - 32:7, 32:9 25 [2] - 1:8, 44:4 2500 [1] - 2:14 27 [3] - 15:24, 21:23, 21:24 28 [7] - 57:4, 70:9, 70:13, 71:5, 71:13, 71:25, 73:23 2900 [1] - 1:17 2nd [1] - 31:17	A a.m [2] - 3:3, 51:4 ability [2] - 57:20, 72:9 able [17] - 8:6, 10:12, 11:21, 12:4, 39:11, 48:15, 48:25, 49:1, 49:15, 50:17, 58:20, 64:16, 65:25, 66:23, 68:18, 68:19, 69:14 above-entitled [1] -	47:10, 50:3 adequacy[1] - 21:20 adjust[1] - 31:4 advance[2] - 66:13, 69:3 advantage[1] - 64:17 advising [1] - 53:23 affiliation [1] - 11:24 afraid [1] - 73:4 afternoon [1] - 48:5 agenda [13] - 4:14, 15:7, 17:8, 32:17,	AND[1] - 1:10 ANNA[1] - 2:23 Anna[1] - 4:8 another's[1] - 7:15 anticipate[1] - 52:8 Antonio[1] - 2:3 anytime[1] - 62:20 anyway[4] - 52:17, 54:3, 56:8, 69:10 anyways[1] - 66:6 API[10] - 14:13, 34:5, 34:25, 36:17, 37:11,	19:11, 26:6, 26:7, 39:9 awhile [1] - 16:25 B background [1] - 47:23 backtracking [1] - 35:18 ball [1] - 58:1
23rd [2] - 32:7, 32:9 25 [2] - 1:8, 44:4 2500 [1] - 2:14 27 [3] - 15:24, 21:23, 21:24 28 [7] - 57:4, 70:9, 70:13, 71:5, 71:13, 71:25, 73:23 2900 [1] - 1:17 2nd [1] - 31:17	A a.m [2] - 3:3, 51:4 ability [2] - 57:20, 72:9 able [17] - 8:6, 10:12, 11:21, 12:4, 39:11, 48:15, 48:25, 49:1, 49:15, 50:17, 58:20, 64:16, 65:25, 66:23, 68:18, 68:19, 69:14 above-entitled [1] - 73:19	47:10, 50:3 adequacy[1] - 21:20 adjust[1] - 31:4 advance[2] - 66:13, 69:3 advantage[1] - 64:17 advising[1] - 53:23 affiliation[1] - 11:24 afraid[1] - 73:4 afternoon[1] - 48:5 agenda[13] - 4:14,	AND[1] - 1:10 ANNA[1] - 2:23 Anna[1] - 4:8 another's[1] - 7:15 anticipate[1] - 52:8 Antonio[1] - 2:3 anytime[1] - 62:20 anyway[4] - 52:17, 54:3, 56:8, 69:10 anyways[1] - 66:6 API[10] - 14:13, 34:5,	19:11, 26:6, 26:7, 39:9 awhile [1] - 16:25 B background [1] - 47:23 backtracking [1] - 35:18 ball [1] - 58:1 based [5] - 5:17, 15:3,

26:23, 30:3, 37:17,

38:17, 47:16, 53:14,

basis [3] - 9:18, 17:13, 59:8
batch [3] - 34:24,
37:23, 42:14
batches [11] - 35:10,
35:11, 35:15, 36:12,
36:16, 36:21, 39:17,
42:8, 42:15, 42:24,
43:3
Bates [12] - 35:12,
35:14, 36:9, 36:23,
39:25, 41:7, 41:14,
41:15, 41:20, 42:7,
42:19, 44:3
Baylen [1] - 1:20
bearing [1] - 63:22
become [2] - 11:19,
44:17
becoming [1] - 73:2
bed [2] - 24:12, 36:25
beforehand [1] -
66:22
began [1] - 58:3
beginning [1] - 23:24
behalf [2] - 47:21,
50:1
behind [2] - 3:17,
59:12
behold [1] - 15:24
believes [1] - 14:20
bellwether [5] - 50:9,
57:4, 57:12, 69:19,
72:13
Benicar [3] - 59:10,
59:12, 64:11
best[1] - 72:1
bet [1] - 26:23
better [1] - 3:17
between [6] - 34:25,
40:11, 43:25, 49:3,
62:23, 65:25
bide [1] - 10:23
big [1] - 70:24
binding [1] - 40:1
bit [3] - 8:5, 23:11,
67:20
Bloomberg [4] - 2:23,
4:9, 16:15, 16:16
board [1] - 59:2
Boldt [3] - 47:11, 48:1,
53:7
BOLDT [4] - 2:2,
47:11, 49:21, 53:7
book [1] - 67:9
bothers [1] - 32:8
bought [1] - 23:10
branded [1] - 63:3
break [1] - 18:2
breaking [4] - 14:20,
22:20, 25:4, 55:7

breast[1] - 57:23 **BRENT**[1] - 2:5 Brief [1] - 51:4 briefed [1] - 8:12 briefing [1] - 8:11 briefly [2] - 24:18, 55:17 briefs [1] - 12:10 bring [4] - 22:14, 43:24, 51:23, 54:6 **bringing** [1] - 24:13 brings [1] - 27:5 broad [2] - 15:4, 27:20 broader [2] - 35:13, broke[1] - 23:4 Brooks [2] - 54:15, 54:19 brought [2] - 12:20, 26:17 brush [1] - 15:4 Bryant [1] - 54:15 Building [2] - 1:7, 2:3 burden [3] - 57:8, 73:1 burdensome [4] -40:22, 41:3, 64:23, 69:1 **bursting** [1] - 24:22 business [2] - 62:21, 63:11 businesspersons [1] - 62:13 BY [9] - 1:14, 1:17, 1:20, 2:2, 2:5, 2:8, 2:9, 2:13, 2:13 bye [2] - 51:3 bye-bye [1] - 51:3

C

Calderon [2] - 18:15,

calendar 131 - 5:22.

8:22, 32:12

29:19

Camden [2] - 1:8, 52:2 camera [1] - 21:11 Camille [5] - 1:22, 45:8, 51:16, 51:17, 73:21 camillepedano@ gmail.com [1] - 1:23 cancer[3] - 70:4, 70:23, 71:2 cannot [2] - 28:21, 48:14 capacity [1] - 67:23 capturing [2] - 65:3, 65:4 care [1] - 68:3 CASE [1] - 1:5

case [26] - 15:18,

54:19, 58:11, 60:23, 61:24, 62:14, 62:25, 63:6, 63:10, 64:17, 65:9, 65:14, 65:24, 67:23, 68:9, 70:15, 70:16, 70:25, 72:9, 73:2 case-specific [1] -47:16 cases [17] - 48:19, 52:25, 54:21, 57:9, 57:21, 57:24, 58:6, 58:14, 64:16, 70:22, 71:3, 71:14, 71:15, 71:16, 71:17, 71:25 Cassandra [1] - 54:14 category [1] - 12:10 CCR[1] - 73:21 cell [1] - 26:13 certain [10] - 13:13, 13:14, 13:15, 13:25, 14:24, 27:4, 27:5, 27:21, 38:19, 63:3 certainly [21] - 8:2, 8:17, 9:7, 9:11, 21:23, 23:7, 26:2, 30:2, 30:4, 31:3, 32:4, 32:17, 37:7, 40:19, 49:6, 53:25, 58:23, 58:24, 59:17, 63:25, 69:7 certify [1] - 73:18 chain [3] - 38:22, 39:1, 41:18 chance [1] - 47:14 changed [4] - 19:17. 23:19, 36:6, 46:11 **chase**[1] - 64:6 check[2] - 13:16, 33:4 checked [1] - 53:20 **Chen** [5] - 7:17, 11:14, 12:8, 12:9, 12:10 Chen's [7] - 4:16, 6:3, 7:16, 10:10, 11:5, 11:9, 12:15 Cheryll [2] - 18:15, 29:18 China [2] - 6:8, 11:14 Chinese [3] - 12:11, 24:1, 29:13 choice[1] - 26:23 Chris [1] - 3:21 chromatography [1] -20:23 circumstances[1] -

CIVIL [1] - 1:3 civil [2] - 52:4 claim [1] - 8:10 clarify [1] - 42:12 clarity [3] - 36:5, 36:22, 36:25 clean [1] - 21:1 clear [18] - 7:11, 7:21, 15:2, 15:15, 23:23, 25:5, 26:4, 27:19, 28:4, 28:6, 28:8, 28:10, 29:1, 29:2, 34:23, 40:15, 43:18, 61:19 clearly [5] - 20:21, 35:1, 36:24, 37:25, 38:3 Clerk [2] - 2:21, 33:4 client [8] - 27:3, 34:13, 34:15, 37:21, 40:24, 41:3, 70:6 clients [1] - 70:16 clock [3] - 31:25, 32:10, 32:25 close[1] - 26:11 closely [1] - 27:7 closer[1] - 10:11 closure[1] - 36:8 **CMC** [1] - 49:5 Cohen [1] - 1:7 coincides [1] - 7:1 colleague [2] - 10:4, 40:12 colleagues [2] -18:13, 18:15 collected [8] - 10:9, 10:12, 24:25, 25:1, 25:12, 25:17, 25:24, 29:9 collecting [1] - 60:13 collection [1] - 44:6 color [1] - 15:5 comfortable [1] - 5:24 coming [4] - 20:8. 49:2. 60:11. 61:19 Commencing [1] - 1:9 committee [2] - 52:12, 52:14 communication [5] -34:22, 65:1, 65:5, 65:8, 68:13 communications [2] -66:19, 66:22 companies [2] -37:16, 62:12 company [3] - 23:6, 23:16, 68:5 company's [1] - 63:11 compare [1] - 44:8

compel [5] - 30:8,

30:22, 31:21, 42:2 complete [5] - 13:12, 17:18, 28:24, 31:24, 38:10 completely [3] - 14:8, 17:10, 27:1 completeness[1] -32:16 **completion** [2] - 7:1, 26:8 complex [1] - 57:10 complications [1] -70:5 comply [1] - 24:23 comprehensive[2] -30:22, 32:2 **compromise**[1] - 67:1 computer [2] - 1:25, 22:20 computer-aided [1] -1:25 conceded [1] - 28:20 concern [3] - 16:14, 18:17, 48:16 concerned [2] - 44:4. 44:5 concerning [1] - 22:11 concerns [1] - 32:16 concluded [1] - 73:15 **conclusion** [1] - 61:2 concrete [2] - 4:22, 33:13 conduct [6] - 4:12, 21:10, 21:11, 22:4, 33:1, 49:9 conducted [2] - 14:12, 57:1 confer [23] - 4:23, 5:17, 6:9, 6:14, 6:17, 10:8, 13:6, 13:7, 13:13, 13:17, 18:12, 19:3, 22:16, 23:2, 23:14, 34:8, 40:19, 46:3, 46:25, 47:14, 48:3, 48:4, 48:10 conference [8] - 4:10, 4:12, 4:13, 11:5, 21:18, 49:10, 50:18, 53:15 CONFERENCE [1] -1:5 conferred [2] - 46:21, 55:14 conferring [1] - 4:10 confers [4] - 28:20, 36:6, 37:14, 64:10 confidence 131 -16:18, 18:21, 21:19 confidential [2] -16:16, 21:13

21:9

cite [1] - 59:18

cited [2] - 37:6, 43:10

confidentiality [10] -16:11, 16:21, 17:6, 17:7, 18:3, 18:11, 18:14, 18:15, 18:23, 22:1 confirm [2] - 38:10, 40.1 confirmation [1] -33:14 confirmed [1] - 52:12 confused [1] - 40:3 confusing [1] - 39:13 confusion [1] - 41:14 connect[1] - 14:1 consequences [1] -21:15 consider [2] - 7:3, 15:11 considering [1] - 8:19 constant [1] - 34:21 contact[11] - 50:17, 62:21, 63:25, 65:1, 65:10, 66:3, 66:24, 67:11, 67:19, 67:20, 68:23 contacts [1] - 62:13 contain [1] - 35:15 contains [1] - 18:4 contamination [1] -19:19 contemplated [1] -39:4 contested [2] - 21:7, 47:1 continue [11] - 12:20, 16:8, 32:15, 48:10, 48:25, 49:12, 50:4, 50:18, 54:20, 71:10, 72:10 Continued [1] - 2:1 contract[1] - 70:5 contracted [1] - 70:4 contradict [1] - 14:25 convenient [1] - 5:19 conversation [2] -64:21, 67:2 conversations [1] -62:23 COON[1] - 2:5 Cooper [1] - 1:7 copied [1] - 19:18 copy [6] - 19:15, 19:16, 19:19, 37:18, 37:19, 68:18 correct[12] - 9:8, 12:8, 42:25, 43:1, 43:4, 46:12, 52:19, 60:7, 60:8, 60:10, 60:11, 73:18 correspondence [2] -

38:9, 43:25 Cotes [1] - 53:22 counsel [20] - 6:5, 15:12, 25:20, 28:7, 31:3, 38:9, 39:24, 48:1, 48:13, 57:2, 58:14. 59:16. 59:25. 61:15. 66:15. 67:24. 68:7, 68:14, 68:23, 69:2 counsel's [2] - 8:19, 39:12 count [3] - 8:9, 10:13 counted [1] - 39:1 country [2] - 12:1, 49:19 country's [1] - 37:11 counts [1] - 19:25 couple [5] - 7:19, 8:4, 22:7, 46:22, 62:10 course[4] - 6:23, 7:16, 40:25, 50:9 court [5] - 25:22, 47:16, 51:13, 51:24, 58:17 COURT [6] - 1:1, 25:3, 25:6, 45:9, 51:15, 51:18 Court [17] - 1:22, 5:12, 16:18, 17:4, 17:8, 22:2, 25:20, 28:8, 28:20, 33:4, 49:2, 58:24, 59:7, 61:19, 62:3, 69:25, 73:21 Court's [5] - 10:18, 15:5, 49:14, 69:20, 72.8 courthouse [2] - 52:6, 73:10 **Courthouse** [1] - 1:7 courthouses [1] -52:3 **Courtroom** [1] - 2:22 courtrooms [1] - 52:4 covered[1] - 45:14 covering [1] - 4:12 COVID[6] - 48:16, 48:17, 49:17, 70:4, 70:5, 71:24 CRC[1] - 73:21 created [1] - 19:17 criminal [1] - 52:5 CRR [1] - 73:21 crying [1] - 27:6 crystalize [1] - 25:21 current[1] - 35:6 custodial [8] - 4:16,

4:19, 6:3, 8:8, 10:10,

11:10, 19:10, 19:20

custodian [1] - 19:11

custodians [2] -13:15, 19:21 D dam [1] - 24:22 Daniel [6] - 49:25, 53:2, 55:20, 55:23, 56:16, 64:8 **DANIEL** [1] - 1:20 darndest[1] - 28:5 data[11] - 19:7, 20:17, 21:2, 24:2, 24:3, 24:16, 24:25, 25:12, 25:17, 26:10, 37:16 data's [1] - 20:25 Date [1] - 73:23 date [7] - 19:17, 19:18, 19:25, 22:14, 30:17, 51:23, 54:6 dates [5] - 6:12, 7:11, 8:18, 8:22, 36:24 DAVIS [1] - 2:13 days [2] - 31:11, 46:22 de [2] - 46:20, 46:23 de-designated [1] -46:23 de-designations [1] -46:20 deadline [7] - 10:18, 19:3, 21:14, 32:22, 32:24, 33:13, 44:25 deal [1] - 21:19 dealing [1] - 45:2 deals [1] - 45:11 **Debbie**[1] - 54:13 December [5] - 20:2, 23:25, 24:7, 26:6 decide [2] - 24:10, 61:15 decides [1] - 6:24 decision [8] - 9:8, 9:10, 9:15, 21:19, 44:12, 70:18, 72:23 decisions [1] - 9:18 declaration [1] - 22:20 **DeClerk**[3] - 53:11, 53:14, 53:18 declined [1] - 72:12 defendant[3] - 38:25, 62:12, 66:2 Defendants [3] - 2:10, 2:15, 2:19 defendants [22] -32:23, 38:21, 47:22, 48:21, 50:13, 52:21, 52:24, 55:4, 55:11, 55:16, 57:8, 58:12, 58:21, 59:12, 59:14, 62:20, 65:11, 66:18,

73:8 defendants' [9] -45:15, 47:6, 47:9, 47:24, 62:20, 62:23, 67:19, 72:9 defense [10] - 17:9. 19:3. 31:11. 50:6. 52:22. 53:12. 54:18. 55:12, 67:22, 70:13 defer[2] - 6:2, 10:4 deficiencies [5] -15:16, 27:20, 30:5, 30:9, 30:17 deficiency [2] - 31:19, 31:22 definition [1] - 7:20 delay [1] - 8:17 deliberately [1] -19:14 demand [1] - 69:7 demonstrative[1] -14:24 denied [1] - 11:17 department [1] - 63:17 depos [1] - 71:9 depose [5] - 57:19. 60:7, 66:9, 67:1, 67:3 deposed [6] - 11:14, 12:1, 12:14, 20:15, 58:4, 63:24 deposition [27] - 4:16, 5:21, 6:4, 6:7, 6:12, 7:6, 7:7, 9:2, 9:4, 9:14, 11:5, 11:10, 17:3, 48:21, 55:14, 56:12, 59:23, 64:2, 68:2, 68:10, 68:11, 68:16, 68:20, 68:22, 69:6, 72:7, 72:20 **Deposition** [1] - 64:12 depositions [36] -20:14, 44:10, 47:7, 48:11, 48:15, 56:24, 57:1, 57:2, 57:3, 58:13, 58:17, 58:20, 59:2, 59:5, 59:16, 60:19, 69:21, 69:24, 70:1, 70:2, 70:8, 70:12, 71:12, 71:14, 71:16, 71:17, 71:20, 71:25, 72:3, 72:4, 72:8, 72:9, 72:18 Deputy [1] - 2:22 describe [1] - 25:16 described [1] - 20:18 designated [2] -21:12, 46:23 designations [1] -46:20

destruction [1] -26:25 detail [1] - 64:21 detailed [3] - 32:17, 34:16, 34:18 details [1] - 65:8 detection [1] - 14:13 determination [2] -6:14, 46:2 **determine** [4] - 6:18, 46:25, 47:1, 63:8 device [6] - 23:5, 23:23, 24:24, 25:16, 26:9, 26:10 devices [7] - 22:11, 22:12, 23:3, 25:11, 25:16, 26:5, 27:4 DFS [1] - 66:7 different [7] - 12:10, 12:13, 13:8, 43:15, 58:7, 58:9, 67:20 difficult [2] - 35:3, 57:25 direct [1] - 66:24 directed [2] - 28:16, 29:8 direction [2] - 67:2, 69:20 directly [1] - 64:18 disagree [2] - 46:4, 57:6 disclose [2] - 64:22, 68:8 disclosed [1] - 64:19 disconnect [2] -23:18, 41:14 discovered [1] - 15:23 discovery [9] - 12:24, 13:21, 15:6, 18:6, 21:21, 22:12, 30:8, 50:11, 66:7 Discovery [2] - 37:6, 43:15 discuss [6] - 18:22, 47:15, 50:2, 50:10, 63:5, 69:19 discussed [6] - 26:5, 28:18, 46:22, 47:13, 63:8, 71:12 discussion [6] -16:18, 26:4, 30:20, 47:12, 49:24, 71:4 discussions [3] -37:9, 43:18, 46:1 dismissal [1] - 52:25 dismissed [4] - 52:18, 53:5, 53:9, 54:4 dispute [3] - 56:22, 59:6, 60:3 disputed [3] - 14:8,

67:12, 68:3, 72:11,

14:9, 14:18 disputes [7] - 5:18, 14:22, 15:6, 46:3, 55:15, 56:22, 58:2 distant [1] - 73:11 distributor [1] - 36:15 distributors [1] -41:19 District [4] - 3:2, 52:3, 52:10, 52:15 **DISTRICT** [3] - 1:1, 1:1, 1:10 **DMF**[1] - 39:12 docket[1] - 17:9 doctor [16] - 64:18, 64:21, 65:6, 67:1, 67:3, 69:24, 70:12, 71:14, 71:16, 71:17, 71:19, 71:25, 72:3, 72:7, 72:18 doctors [11] - 64:14, 65:2, 66:4, 66:8, 66:24, 67:8, 67:11, 68:1, 68:15, 68:22, doctors' [1] - 71:12 document [28] - 7:2. 7:9, 7:22, 7:24, 8:9, 9:20, 13:24, 15:1, 16:20, 16:24, 16:25, 17:1, 18:18, 18:22, 19:22, 19:23, 19:25, 20:5, 20:6, 20:13, 21:14, 21:21, 26:19, 26:22, 29:23, 34:13, 69:7, 69:8 documentation [1] -23:13 documents [63] - 8:7, 8:15, 9:24, 10:1, 10:10, 10:11, 10:14, 10:15, 10:25, 13:14, 13:25, 19:14, 19:15, 20:17, 21:15, 22:17, 22:18, 22:21, 22:22, 25:24, 26:12, 26:25, 29:9, 29:15, 29:18, 29:20, 31:16, 34:12, 34:23, 34:24, 34:25, 35:3, 35:9, 35:14, 36:10, 36:12, 37:7, 37:20, 38:4, 38:14, 39:15, 40:21, 41:15, 41:21, 43:10, 43:12, 44:8, 44:9, 46:20, 46:24, 47:1, 67:24, 68:4, 68:5, 68:6, 68:10, 68:12, 68:17, 68:19 domain [2] - 17:17

Dominion [1] - 2:3 done [14] - 5:19, 6:25, 8:25, 21:3, 21:4, 23:16, 31:8, 31:17, 40:16, 50:21, 50:23, 64:4, 64:16, 72:25 Dong [1] - 20:1 dose[3] - 36:17, 36:18, 39:3 doubt [1] - 62:1 down [6] - 14:20, 15:12, 18:2, 25:18, 59:6, 71:5 downstream [1] -41:19 Dr[4] - 15:24, 22:20, 23:5, 28:14 draw[1] - 20:3 Drive[1] - 2:3 drives [1] - 21:2 drop [1] - 50:15 drug [2] - 63:19, 68:2 Drugs [2] - 2:19, 46:8 drugs [2] - 57:15, 63:3 Du [1] - 20:15 **DUANE**[1] - 2:8 due [2] - 4:20, 44:24 duplicate [2] - 19:11, 19:21 during [6] - 4:23, 10:8, 20:13, 22:16, 23:2, 23:14

Ε

early [2] - 48:1, 72:6 easier[1] - 66:11 easily [2] - 39:25 easy[1] - 26:11 ECF[1] - 17:9 EDNEY [2] - 2:23, 4:7 Edney [3] - 4:6, 4:8, 4:11 effect [1] - 63:16 efficiently [2] - 5:15, 11:2 eight [2] - 59:1, 71:5 **Eisenhower** [1] - 1:14 either [7] - 8:13, 13:16, 17:14, 20:21, 23:4, 36:4, 72:1 **electronic** [1] - 19:16 email [25] - 14:5, 14:6, 14:7, 15:14, 15:21, 15:25, 17:18, 17:22, 17:24, 17:25, 18:2, 18:4, 19:8, 19:9, 19:15, 20:1, 20:19, 21:23, 21:24, 21:25, 28:11, 28:12, 40:14, 40:15, 53:22

emailed [1] - 48:2 emails [2] - 20:2, 27:5 employee [4] - 24:4, 24:15, 26:14, 66:3 employees [7] -12:13, 24:17, 65:11, 66:3, 66:23, 67:7, 67:9 employer[1] - 24:1 employment[1] -13:15 enable[1] - 21:19 encompass[1] -21:23 encompassed [3] -23:7, 23:13, 23:23 encouraged [1] -32:15 end [4] - 25:19, 31:8, 37:22, 59:1 ended [2] - 39:3, 58:9 entire [2] - 38:21, 44:6 entirely [1] - 69:1 entitled [5] - 21:25, 27:22, 66:6, 68:12, 73:19 **ESI**[3] - 24:24, 25:11, 25:22 especially [3] - 15:2, 71:15, 71:23 ESQUIRE [10] - 1:14, 1:17, 1:20, 2:2, 2:8, 2:9, 2:13, 2:13, 2:17, 2:21 essentially [2] - 46:24,

56:10 established [1] - 8:16 evaluate [1] - 6:13 evaluating [1] - 6:11 evaluation [1] - 6:20 evaluations [1] -47:16 evidence [4] - 14:1, 15:2, 27:1, 27:17 evidentiary [1] - 30:10 ex [2] - 62:23, 67:22 exactly [2] - 5:23, 10:22 examined [1] - 49:17 **example** [7] - 8:6, 9:25, 14:3, 15:18, 20:7, 57:12, 57:22 examples [1] - 43:14 exception [2] - 9:9, 59:19 exchange [3] - 46:1, 47:25, 58:3 exchanging [1] - 61:3 excuse [3] - 47:19, 58:19, 63:13

exercise[1] - 58:4 exhibits [1] - 14:24 exist [3] - 20:21. 29:16, 41:4 existed [1] - 20:21 exists [2] - 34:14, 37:17 **expanded** [1] - 30:21 expect [4] - 5:23, 11:4, 31:17, 32:18 expected [2] - 18:20, 21:24 expecting [3] - 3:16, 30:24, 45:19 **expedite** [1] - 9:16 expeditiously [1] experienced [2] -58:14, 59:16 expert[1] - 33:13 expired [2] - 17:2, 17:5 explain [1] - 4:1 explains [1] - 25:14 extensive [1] - 8:11 extent [1] - 41:17 extremely [3] - 37:17, 40:22, 65:9

F facilities [1] - 35:24 facility [1] - 15:22 fact [11] - 8:12, 10:9, 17:11, 19:6, 29:8, 38:25, 50:7, 57:7, 58:18, 60:10, 60:12 facts [1] - 9:19 factually [1] - 20:10 fair [5] - 32:4, 60:17, 62:5, 67:1, 68:7 faith [2] - 9:17, 39:20 family [2] - 70:15, 70:17 far [3] - 44:11, 44:16, 65:21 fashion [3] - 5:19, 5:23, 21:17 faster [1] - 31:2 favorably [1] - 72:24 FDA [1] - 68:6 federal [1] - 59:22 felt[1] - 48:2 Ferretti [2] - 40:12, 43:25 Ferretti's [1] - 40:14 few [2] - 51:6, 56:22 fight [1] - 44:19 figure [1] - 8:5 figured [1] - 15:20

file [8] - 4:16, 4:20,

6:3, 8:8, 10:10, 11:10, 19:10, 19:20 filed [6] - 17:4, 17:5, 17:8, 32:10, 32:25, 53:21 filing [1] - 32:24 final [3] - 18:24, 36:8, 46:2 finalized [1] - 61:10 finally [3] - 3:24, 20:11, 71:23 fine [3] - 45:9, 50:5, 51:20 finish [1] - 16:3 finished [4] - 36:16, 36:18, 39:3, 53:21 first [15] - 4:15, 8:20, 17:16, 24:13, 26:5, 35:9, 37:5, 39:7, 39:17, 42:5, 43:9, 48:12, 58:7, 70:1, 71:21 five [2] - 54:13, 62:16 flabbergasting [1] flag [1] - 49:1 flagging [1] - 8:4 floor [1] - 4:17 Florida [1] - 1:21 focus [1] - 14:17 focused [1] - 36:21 follow [3] - 12:21, 30:12, 63:18 followed [1] - 30:9 FOR [1] - 1:1 force [2] - 24:2, 24:16 forced [2] - 27:15, 27:16 foreclosed [1] - 61:5 foregoing [1] - 73:18 form [1] - 41:4 formal [1] - 30:21 former [1] - 40:12 forth [3] - 12:9, 13:9, 29:2 forward [6] - 10:24, 14:22, 40:15, 48:11, 70:19, 71:5 four [9] - 51:6, 52:11, 54:13, 54:20, 54:22, 57:13, 57:22, 58:9, 62:16 fourth [1] - 52:13 framework[2] - 8:16, 11:3 frankly [10] - 15:6, 17:7, 18:3, 19:9, 24:11, 26:7, 26:24,

27:13, 33:12, 65:3

FREEMAN[1] - 1:13

front [2] - 18:19, 37:12 fulfilled [1] - 43:11 full [1] - 73:5 fully [3] - 31:19, 31:20, 52:8 fun [1] - 4:1 future [1] - 73:11

G

G.C[1] - 20:23

gain [1] - 64:17

Garcia [1] - 57:13

gas [1] - 20:23 gasp [1] - 26:20 GEDDIS [1] - 3:21 Geddis [1] - 3:21 generic [1] - 63:2 generically [1] - 25:17 Georgia [1] - 2:14 given [4] - 14:23, 31:18, 35:12, 73:2 glitches [1] - 10:16 Gloria [1] - 54:14 Goldberg [13] - 3:9, 5:8, 6:1, 9:8, 9:12, 9:22, 11:15, 12:5, 12:18, 16:9, 17:15, 18:9, 50:14 GOLDBERG [13] - 2:8, 3:10, 6:2, 6:22, 10:3, 12:6, 16:6, 16:13, 16:16, 16:22, 18:7, 18:10, 50:13 **GOLOMB**[1] - 1:16 goose [1] - 64:6 government[2] -11:25, 12:12 grade [17] - 34:5, 34:11, 34:25, 35:19, 35:22, 37:10, 37:23, 39:8, 40:6, 42:15, 42:17, 42:25, 43:3, 43:10, 43:13, 43:17, 44:12 grandstand[1] -18:19 grandstanding[1] -19:6 granted [1] - 4:10 great [3] - 21:19, 32:20, 72:22 Greenberg [4] - 47:22, 52:21, 55:4, 55:11 GREENBERG [1] -2:12 grieve [1] - 70:17 grounds [1] - 20:10 group [4] - 29:9, 52:22, 53:12, 55:12 growing [1] - 48:15

grows [2] - 73:2, 73:3 **GUERRA** [1] - 2:2 quess [8] - 4:20, 8:19, 9:10, 15:11, 24:22, 25:14, 25:23, 45:23 quidance [3] - 56:23, 58:24. 72:8 gun [4] - 20:6, 20:7, 26:19, 26:20

Н

Hague [1] - 24:5 handheld [1] - 25:16 handle [1] - 8:23 handling [1] - 18:13 happenings [1] -22:19 happy [7] - 10:16, 29:24, 38:5, 42:18, 43:24, 48:10, 48:13 hard [6] - 20:8, 21:2, 32:22, 32:24, 37:18, 37:19 Harkins [1] - 52:20 HARKINS [4] - 2:13, 52:20, 53:12, 54:18 heading [1] - 30:7 heads [1] - 49:9 Healthcare [1] - 2:11 hear [12] - 10:17, 12:3, 15:8, 16:9, 17:14, 40:6, 42:6, 49:13, 49:19, 55:8, 60:4, 66:13 heard [9] - 8:20, 22:24, 24:23, 38:11, 40:4, 40:17, 53:18, 56:10, 70:25 hearing [21] - 8:24, 14:23, 18:1, 18:21, 21:10, 21:20, 22:4, 27:19, 30:10, 32:13, 33:1, 33:3, 33:5, 43:23, 49:11, 52:13, 52:14, 54:3, 54:4 hearings [1] - 39:22 heart [1] - 14:18 held [2] - 3:1, 30:11 hello [3] - 3:22, 51:12, 51:17 helpful [4] - 5:12. 7:10, 14:21, 33:18 helps [1] - 25:21 Henton [1] - 54:14 Hetero [4] - 2:19, 45:11, 46:8 Hetero's [1] - 46:17 Hi [1] - 3:21 hi [1] - 56:6

highlighted [2] -

26:15, 72:12 highly [3] - 18:4, 29:12, 64:3 HILL [1] - 2:17 himself [1] - 23:11 histories [1] - 57:10 history [1] - 5:17 hit [5] - 8:8, 9:24, 10:13, 45:24 hives [3] - 63:16, 63:19 hold [1] - 50:20 **holding** [1] - 45:8 holiday [2] - 6:23, 31:1

honest [2] - 48:4, 69:3 HONIK[3] - 1:16, 1:17, 3:15 Honik [1] - 3:15 Honor [137] - 3:10, 3:15, 4:18, 5:18, 5:20, 5:24, 6:2, 6:5, 6:6, 6:10, 6:22, 7:5, 8:7, 8:13, 8:16, 10:3, 10:6, 10:16, 10:21, 11:11, 12:6, 12:9, 13:2. 13:5. 13:11. 13:20, 14:3, 14:15, 14:20, 14:25, 15:10, 15:18, 16:2, 16:6, 16:7, 16:13, 16:22, 16:23, 17:16, 17:20, 17:24, 18:2, 18:7, 18:21, 19:9, 19:11, 19:24, 22:15, 23:1, 23:22, 24:11, 24:18, 26:1, 26:3, 26:18, 27:2, 27:10, 27:14, 27:16, 27:18, 27:25, 28:6, 28:9, 29:4, 30:23, 31:3, 31:9, 31:14, 32:6, 33:10, 33:20, 33:25, 35:8, 36:7, 37:2, 38:2, 38:5, 38:20, 39:18, 39:22, 39:25, 40:15, 41:2, 42:9, 42:12, 43:1, 43:4, 43:8, 43:24, 44:14, 44:20, 45:4, 45:6, 45:9, 45:17, 45:25, 46:7, 46:12, 46:14, 46:18, 47:2, 47:3, 47:11,

60:4, 64:8, 67:14, 67:16, 71:6, 71:8, 71:9, 72:4, 72:15, 72:17, 73:6, 73:8, 73:12 Honor's [5] - 4:19, 11:23, 56:23, 61:19, 72:2 Honorable [3] - 2:21, 3:1, 3:3 HONORABLE [2] -1:10, 1:11 hope [1] - 15:4 hopeful [1] - 47:15 hopefully [1] - 49:15 hoping [1] - 45:18 hotly [1] - 21:7 Huahai [1] - 2:11 huge [2] - 37:16, 37:21 hurdle [1] - 61:10 hypertension [1] -57:14

idea [7] - 11:18, 27:2. 33:2, 38:1, 38:13, 60:14, 67:5 identification [1] -42:7 identified [10] - 8:8, 22:17, 38:3, 41:7, 58:6, 60:12, 61:20, 62:1, 65:21, 65:23 identifies [1] - 30:16 identify [9] - 13:14, 36:9, 36:11, 39:19, 41:13, 59:5, 62:12, 62:20, 64:13 identifying [3] - 30:9, 44:16, 60:6 *illustrates* [1] - 58:5 imagine [1] - 69:8 imminent[1] - 41:12 imminently [1] - 8:14 impending [1] - 33:13 importance [1] - 30:13 important [5] - 6:10, 6:18, 7:4, 60:15 imposed [4] - 8:24, 59:11, 59:22, 59:24 impossible[1] - 38:23 improper[1] - 27:1 impropriety [1] -19:22 improvement[1] -14:5 impurities [1] - 37:9 *impurity* [5] - 14:13,

15:25, 16:1, 28:18,

37:9 IN [1] - 1:4 in-person [3] - 33:2. 33:5, 47:6 Inc [2] - 2:15, 2:16 inclined [2] - 49:3, 72:24 include [2] - 48:9, 61:11 included [5] - 34:10, 47:23, 47:25, 55:16, 62:11 including [2] - 34:16, 47:13 incorrectly [1] - 40:7 incredulous [1] -23:12 indeed [1] - 21:8 independent[1] -36:14 indicate [1] - 69:6 individual [3] - 24:2, 24:5, 24:9 indulge [1] - 31:5 Industries [1] - 2:15 industry [1] - 25:23 information [19] -10:24, 11:23, 13:15, 16:10, 17:6, 18:4, 21:12, 24:2, 24:3, 24:17, 25:24, 26:11, 36:2, 36:24, 41:2, 42:13, 57:18, 64:23, 67:4 initial [2] - 47:25, 58:3 initiate [1] - 59:4 injury [1] - 71:2 injustice [1] - 57:20 innovator [1] - 63:3 inoperable [1] - 22:11 insight[1] - 12:15 instances [3] - 58:8, 63:13, 68:4 instinct [1] - 14:17 intend [2] - 6:14, 8:2 intensely [1] - 33:16 intent [1] - 59:12 interest [2] - 11:2, 58:12 **interrupt** [1] - 5:3 **interrupted** [1] - 25:2 interrupting [1] -17:12 interrupts [1] - 63:11

intervention [4] -

invite [1] - 8:3

63:9

46:19, 47:17, 49:14

involved [2] - 23:25,

involvement[1] -

47:19, 49:21, 49:25,

50:12, 50:13, 50:20,

52:20, 53:2, 53:7,

53:8, 53:12, 53:17,

55:13, 55:20, 55:22,

56:16, 56:17, 56:21,

54:18, 55:3, 55:6,

40:13 involving [1] - 62:24 iPhone [1] - 23:5 iPhones [1] - 25:17 irbesartan [3] - 14:5, 16:1, 18:8 issuance[1] - 7:17 issue [56] - 6:11, 6:18, 6:24, 7:4, 7:13, 7:16, 7:20, 11:19, 16:17, 17:7, 18:6, 18:16, 21:6, 22:6, 22:25, 25:19, 25:21, 26:13, 28:16, 33:9, 34:20, 34:21, 36:8, 39:10, 39:13, 41:2, 41:24, 45:19, 46:19, 47:5, 47:10, 48:15, 48:24, 49:4, 49:23, 50:1, 50:3, 50:8, 53:24, 53:25, 55:13, 55:17, 56:11, 56:17, 57:14, 62:16, 63:19, 64:6, 65:5, 67:17, 67:19, 68:20, 71:6, 73:4 issued [4] - 6:7, 12:8, 12:15, 22:1 issues [31] - 3:17, 7:6, 8:4, 8:13, 8:14, 18:14, 18:16, 18:23, 22:10, 25:24, 30:1, 30:21, 40:17, 44:22, 45:4, 47:2, 47:15, 48:13, 50:11, 53:11, 56:12, 60:1, 62:7, 62:10, 62:24, 67:23, 69:11, 69:13, 69:16, 72:20 IT [1] - 22:21 it'd [1] - 11:18 it'll [1] - 8:15 item [3] - 4:15, 45:11, 55:5 itself [4] - 9:14, 13:24, 18:4, 21:25

Case 1:19-md-02875-RMB-SAK

J

JERSEY [1] - 1:1

Jersey [6] - 1:8, 1:15,
2:18, 52:3, 52:11,
52:16

JESSICA [1] - 2:9

Jessica [2] - 10:4,
10:6

Jinsheng [3] - 14:4,
15:14, 15:24

Joe [1] - 40:12

join [1] - 3:16

joint [2] - 52:21, 55:12

JUDGE [124] - 1:10,

3:4, 3:8, 3:11, 3:25, 4:3, 4:8, 5:3, 6:1, 6:16, 7:25, 9:6, 10:5, 10:19, 11:1, 11:21, 12:4, 12:17, 13:3, 15:8, 16:8, 16:15, 16:20, 17:14, 18:9, 18:24, 21:5, 22:24, 23:21, 24:20, 25:7, 26:2, 28:1, 29:5, 29:25, 31:13, 31:23, 32:7, 33:19, 33:21, 33:23, 35:7, 37:3, 39:5, 39:23, 40:3, 40:9, 41:7, 41:10, 41:25, 42:3, 42:5, 42:10, 42:21, 42:23, 43:2, 43:5, 44:1, 44:13, 44:21, 44:25, 45:5, 45:7, 45:10, 45:19, 45:22, 46:6, 46:9, 46:13, 46:16, 47:4, 47:18, 47:20, 49:6, 49:22, 50:5, 50:14, 50:21, 51:1, 51:3, 51:8, 51:10, 51:13, 51:17, 51:20. 53:1, 53:4, 53:9, 53:16, 53:19, 54:2, 54:8, 54:11, 54:22, 55:2, 55:7, 55:25, 56:5, 56:6, 56:14, 56:19, 60:5, 60:9, 60:14, 60:18, 61:13, 61:23, 62:1, 62:7, 64:7, 65:10, 65:13, 65:17, 65:20, 66:2, 66:8, 66:11, 67:5, 67:15, 68:21, 72:22, 73:7, 73:9, 73:14 Judge [42] - 3:2, 3:22, 4:7, 4:11, 6:24, 7:21, 8:1, 8:20, 9:8, 9:10, 9:15, 11:8, 11:17, 11:22, 33:4, 35:22, 37:12, 38:22, 39:4, 39:10, 49:20, 50:3, 50:4, 50:8, 50:9, 50:16, 50:17, 50:18, 51:5, 51:10, 51:12, 51:15, 54:7, 55:17, 55:24, 56:1, 56:3, 56:6, 56:9, 69:17 judgment[1] - 11:6 Judicial [1] - 2:21 judicial [2] - 46:19, 52:10 judiciary [2] - 52:12, 52:13 July [25] - 4:20, 6:25,

9:11, 15:24, 21:4,

21:23, 21:24, 30:25, 31:2, 31:5, 31:10, 31:12, 31:17, 32:1, 32:8, 32:22, 44:25, 48:12, 49:4, 52:2, 52:14, 53:14, 54:3, 54:4, 54:12 jump [1] - 45:24 Jun [1] - 20:15 June [7] - 1:8, 15:21, 46:22, 70:2, 71:6, 72:15, 73:23 jurors [1] - 52:7 jury [5] - 51:25, 52:1, 52:2, 52:6

Κ

KATZ[1] - 1:13 **keep**[3] - 11:2, 30:1, 73:3 keeping [1] - 52:7 keeps [2] - 35:19, 40:24 Kennedy [1] - 57:22 kept [2] - 20:16, 37:17 key [4] - 56:22, 57:23, 59:5, 60:3 kind [3] - 13:8, 19:13, 70:21 Knight [1] - 54:14 knowledge [1] - 26:5 knows [6] - 6:10, 8:5, 12:9, 15:19, 17:9, 28:9 Knox [5] - 52:25, 53:1, 53:6, 53:7 Kugler [23] - 2:21, 3:2, 4:11, 6:24, 7:21, 8:20, 9:8, 11:8, 11:17, 33:4, 50:3, 50:4, 50:8, 50:9, 50:16, 50:17, 50:18, 51:6, 51:10, 55:24, 56:1, 56:4, 56:6 KUGLER [40] - 1:10, 51:10, 51:13, 51:17, 51:20, 53:4, 53:9, 53:16, 53:19, 54:2, 54:8, 54:11, 54:22, 55:2, 55:7, 56:6, 56:14, 56:19, 60:5, 60:9, 60:14, 60:18, 61:13, 61:23, 62:1, 62:7, 64:7, 65:10, 65:13, 65:17, 65:20, 66:2, 66:8, 66:11, 67:5, 67:15, 68:21, 72:22, 73:7, 73:9 Kugler's [2] - 9:10, 9:15

L labeled [3] - 16:20, 16:24, 34:4 Labor[1] - 52:8 Labs [1] - 2:19 laid [3] - 5:23, 19:11, 28.9 language [6] - 62:11, 64:11, 64:12, 66:20, 69:23 laptop [1] - 22:22 large [2] - 64:15, 71:1 larger [1] - 69:13 LARRY [1] - 2:22 last [15] - 7:14, 20:15, 23:25, 25:7, 26:20, 28:14, 34:22, 35:1, 36:4, 37:18, 38:8, 43:18, 51:25, 55:13, 59:9 latest [2] - 15:3, 31:2 law [2] - 9:18, 24:1 Law [1] - 2:21 lawful [2] - 24:9, 24:15 lawyer [1] - 48:22 lay [1] - 28:5 leadership [2] - 3:19, 47:14 least [5] - 12:20. 23:25, 57:13, 57:15, 62:16 leave [2] - 11:25, 58:17 leaving [1] - 11:14 legal [1] - 8:14 legally [1] - 20:10 **legwork** [1] - 64:2 less [1] - 60:2 letter [30] - 4:24, 6:4, 13:10, 13:19, 13:20, 14:3, 14:9, 14:10, 14:16, 14:21, 15:3, 15:7, 17:8, 17:22, 19:12, 24:11, 27:7, 28:9, 30:1, 31:16, 31:22, 32:17, 33:12, 33:15, 45:14, 45:15, 47:8, 47:9, 50:6, 64:24 letters [7] - 4:14, 30:23, 31:19, 56:20, 66:22, 67:6 letting [1] - 51:8 leveled [1] - 21:8 **LEVIN**[1] - 1:19 **Li**[3] - 17:3, 23:5,

light [3] - 8:12, 16:14, 21:11 likely [3] - 20:25, 25:20, 33:2 limit [8] - 6:19, 7:1, 39:7, 39:11, 40:5, 59:22, 59:23, 60:21 limitation [4] - 58:5. 59:11, 59:19, 61:12 *limitations* [1] - 59:19 limited [3] - 21:22, 57:3, 61:6 Lin [2] - 14:4, 15:24 **Lin's** [2] - 15:14, 19:10 line [13] - 3:13, 4:6, 5:7, 5:8, 14:15, 22:8, 22:9, 50:25, 66:14 linking [1] - 19:24 list[3] - 54:20, 54:22, 67:7 listed [2] - 19:21, 54:15 listening [1] - 56:19 listing [3] - 54:16, 54:23, 63:21 litany [1] - 24:10 literally [3] - 20:6, 35:3 litigants [1] - 58:10 litigation [8] - 15:17, 20:4, 63:20, 63:22, 64:4, 64:5, 65:2, 68:1 **LITIGATION** [1] - 1:4 *litigations* [1] - 64:13 **LLC**[3] - 1:13, 2:11, 2:15 LLP[4] - 2:2, 2:8, 2:12, 2:17 lo [1] - 15:23 local [2] - 23:8, 23:10 Lockard [7] - 47:21, 49:16, 55:3, 55:11, 56:8, 67:16, 68:22 LOCKARD [21] - 2:13, 47:19, 47:21, 49:20, 55:3, 55:9, 56:9, 56:15, 56:21, 60:8, 60:11, 60:17, 60:25, 61:17, 61:24, 62:5, 62:9, 67:16, 69:11, 73:8, 73:13 log [9] - 35:2, 35:4, 38:4, 38:7, 45:12, 65:4, 66:19, 66:22, 68:13 logistical [1] - 7:6 logistics [1] - 52:6 look [9] - 10:24, 21:3, 22:4, 32:12, 36:3,

28:15

Li's [2] - 19:20, 22:20

LIABILITY[1] - 1:4

37:13, 44:3, 44:7, 51:21 looked [2] - 26:16, 34:15 looking [4] - 8:17. 10:2, 38:7, 66:18 looks [1] - 44:5 loosened [1] - 48:18 LORETTA [1] - 2:21 Loretta [3] - 51:5, 51:8, 56:2 lost [5] - 22:3, 25:6, 25:7, 25:10, 56:7 low [1] - 19:25 Ltd [2] - 2:11, 2:15

M

machines [2] - 20:23 Macro [2] - 37:6, 43:15 MacSTRAVIC[1] major [2] - 15:16, 71:18 majority [1] - 70:19 management[1] -53:15 MANAGEMENT[1] -1:5 manner [1] - 34:2 manually [1] - 38:14 manufacture [2] -36:13, 36:18 manufactured [3] -35:24, 36:1 manufacturer[1] -63:2 manufacturers [2] -36:17, 38:24 map [1] - 38:21 March [3] - 69:22, 71:4, 72:11 marked [2] - 35:1, 37:25 Market[1] - 1:17 mass [3] - 20:24, 64:25 massive[3] - 19:22, 31:15 Master[1] - 3:3 **MASTER**[1] - 1:11 matching [1] - 38:18 materials [1] - 55:16 matter [24] - 4:14, 9:13, 11:2, 11:4, 11:7, 12:19, 13:1, 14:18, 22:2, 22:13, 30:1, 30:6, 30:11, 31:23, 32:13, 32:21, 33:1, 33:5, 33:17,

45:14, 49:11, 49:15,

52:23, 73:19 matters [2] - 9:23, 22.7 MAZIE [1] - 1:13 MDL [1] - 58:18 MDLs[4] - 59:14, 59:18, 59:21, 68:1 mean [12] - 20:2, 26:24, 56:19, 59:18, 63:20, 65:22, 66:5, 66:8, 66:12, 70:7, 70:19, 70:25 means [2] - 24:9, 34:5 meantime [1] - 32:20 mechanical [1] - 1:24 medical [2] - 57:10, 68:5 medication [2] - 63:5, 63:15 meet [28] - 4:23, 5:17, 10:8, 10:18, 13:6, 13:7, 13:13, 13:17, 18:12, 19:3, 22:16, 23:2, 23:14, 28:20, 34:8, 36:6, 37:14, 40:19, 46:2, 46:25, 47:14, 48:3, 48:4, 48:10, 64:10, 67:22, 68:1, 68:8 meet-and-confer [3] -13:17, 34:8, 40:19 meeting [3] - 54:12, 63:8, 68:14 memorialized [1] -40:10 mention [3] - 6:4, 7:5, 7:7 mentioned [1] - 6:5 merit [1] - 8:11 met[2] - 46:21, 55:14 metadata [3] - 26:8, 26:9, 26:16 **method** [1] - 60:6 might [6] - 8:9, 11:25, 23:4, 49:9, 60:20, 69:2 Min [3] - 17:3, 19:20, 28:15 minor [1] - 69:11 minutes [2] - 51:6, 51:7 mischaracterization 121 - 17:18, 17:23 mischaracterization s [1] - 15:1 mischaracterize[1] -26:22

mischaracterizing [3]

missed[1] - 21:13

- 14:6, 15:14, 18:18

missing [3] - 22:11, 27:23 mistake [1] - 25:8 Mitchell [1] - 1:7 MITCHELL [1] - 1:19 moment[2] - 14:19, 18:5 moments [1] - 33:11 Monday [2] - 22:18, 22:23 month [2] - 54:2, 54:23 months [10] - 8:3, 9:3, 23:24, 24:12, 24:13, 26:11, 26:15, 26:17 months-and-months -long [1] - 8:3 moots [1] - 32:19 morning [6] - 10:6, 48:1, 51:10, 51:15, 53:20, 53:22 MORRIS [1] - 2:8 most[10] - 3:16, 5:15, 20:4, 21:8, 33:1, 33:16, 34:15, 34:17, 58:8. 60:15 motion [23] - 7:9, 7:23, 17:4, 27:15, 30:2, 30:7, 30:13, 30:16, 30:22, 31:21, 32:1, 32:2, 32:3, 32:9, 32:11, 32:18, 32:19, 32:20, 32:23, 32:24, 42:1, 44:18, 44:23 motions [2] - 27:12, 52:4 motivated [3] - 70:24, 70:25, 71:3 move [6] - 9:13, 17:1, 19:4, 44:12, 49:12, 52:24 moved [2] - 54:20, 67:18 moving [6] - 11:2, 30:2, 31:23, 32:21, 52:7, 55:10 MR [82] - 3:10, 3:15, 3:21, 3:22, 4:1, 4:18, 5:11, 6:2, 6:22, 8:1, 10:3, 10:21, 11:11, 11:22, 12:6, 15:10, 16:3, 16:6, 16:13, 16:16, 16:19, 16:22, 16:23, 18:7, 18:10, 19:2, 23:1, 24:18, 24:21, 25:5, 25:8, 27:25, 28:3, 28:23, 29:17, 29:22, 30:18, 33:10, 35:8, 39:9,

30244

39:24, 41:12, 42:1, 42:9, 44:2, 44:14, 44:24, 45:4, 45:17, 45:23, 46:7, 46:12, 46:14, 46:18, 49:25, 50:12, 50:13, 50:20, 50:23, 51:2, 51:12, 52:20, 53:2, 53:12, 53:17, 53:20, 54:6, 54:18, 55:20, 56:16, 64:8, 65:12, 65:15, 65:19, 65:22, 66:5, 66:10, 66:12, 67:14, 69:18, 73:6, 73:12 MS [60] - 4:7, 10:6, 13:2, 13:5, 16:2, 16:5, 16:7, 16:12, 17:16, 18:8, 22:15, 23:22, 26:1, 26:3, 28:22, 29:4, 29:6, 29:21, 31:14, 32:6, 33:20, 33:22, 33:24, 37:2, 37:5, 40:8, 40:11, 41:9, 42:4, 42:12, 42:22, 43:1, 43:4, 43:7, 45:6, 47:11, 47:19, 47:21, 49:20, 49:21, 51:5, 53:7, 55:3, 55:9, 56:3, 56:9, 56:15, 56:21, 60:8, 60:11, 60:17, 60:25, 61:17, 61:24, 62:5, 62:9, 67:16, 69:11, 73:8, 73:13 multiple [4] - 20:13, 25:15, 57:10 must [1] - 29:6 mute [4] - 5:6, 5:8, 45:18, 66:15

N

Nakul [2] - 46:6, 46:7 NAKUL [1] - 2:17 named [1] - 19:10 names [3] - 58:3, 58:9, 61:4 national [1] - 18:19 natural [4] - 6:25, 70:11, 70:20, 72:16 nauseam [1] - 28:13 **NDMA** [4] - 14:13, 15:20, 15:23, 17:11 **NE** [1] - 2:14 **Nebraska** [1] - 63:5 necessarily[1] - 57:18 necessary [2] - 42:2, 57:7 need [27] - 6:13, 6:17, 6:19, 16:17, 22:9,

30:7, 30:24, 36:7, 48:12, 48:18, 49:14, 49:17, 50:10, 54:24, 57:18, 58:10, 59:21, 60:2, 60:3, 61:14, 61:20, 63:17, 65:3, 68:17, 68:22, 69:17, 70:21 needed [5] - 6:9, 34:3, 48:3, 59:17, 60:22 needs [6] - 8:24, 11:7, 18:16, 32:2, 39:6, 49:7 negotiating [3] -37:19, 56:11, 56:25 negotiations [1] -40:13 never[7] - 24:14, 29:7, 29:16, 38:15, 39:3, 64:4 new [3] - 12:24, 21:21, 39:21 NEW [1] - 1:1 New [6] - 1:8, 1:15, 2:18, 52:3, 52:10, 52:15 News [2] - 2:23, 4:9 next [16] - 6:23, 7:19, 9:4, 11:5, 20:7, 22:3, 45:11, 47:5, 49:2, 49:5, 49:7, 49:11, 49:23, 54:23, 67:15, 69:10 Nigh [9] - 49:25, 53:2, 55:20, 55:23, 56:16, 59:25, 60:5, 64:8, 69:15 NIGH [16] - 1:20. 49:25. 53:2. 55:20. 56:16, 64:8, 65:12, 65:15, 65:19, 65:22, 66:5, 66:10, 66:12, 67:14, 69:18, 73:6 Nigh's [1] - 67:17 **nighttime** [1] - 6:7 nine [4] - 57:17, 57:19, 58:3, 70:2 nitrosamine [13] -14:10, 14:11, 16:1,

27:9, 34:1, 34:4, 34:9, 34:16, 34:20,

43:12 *Nitrosamine* [1] - 35:5 nitrosamines [1] -39:17 noise [1] - 66:13 nominated [1] - 52:11 non [7] - 23:23, 42:25, 43:3, 43:10, 43:13,

37:9, 37:24, 38:6,

44:11, 63:14 non-plaintiff [1] -63:14 non-USDMF [1] -44:11 non-USDMF-grade [3] - 42:25, 43:3, 43:13 non-USDMF-graderelated [1] - 43:10 non-ZHP[1] - 23:23 none [2] - 19:21, 26:13 normal [3] - 13:16, 30:12, 63:11 normalcy [1] - 52:15 not-too-distant[1] -73:11 note [1] - 31:16 nothing [11] - 19:2, 38:11, 40:17, 45:4, 45:6, 47:3, 50:12, 50:13, 63:5, 63:6, 63:10 notice [3] - 27:22, 53:23, 62:20 noticed [2] - 13:6, 50:6 noticing [1] - 58:21 Novartis [1] - 15:20 November [2] - 9:1, 35:1 **NUMBER**[1] - 1:3 number [19] - 19:2, 19:4, 19:5, 35:16, 36:11, 41:8, 41:16, 42:7, 42:18, 56:24, 58:19, 59:2, 59:13, 59:14, 59:18, 64:6, 66:1, 68:20 numbers [7] - 35:14, 36:9, 36:23, 41:14, 41:15, 41:20, 52:9 numerous [1] - 34:19

0

object [1] - 20:11 objecting [1] - 11:14 objection [4] - 43:20, 53:1, 53:3, 53:8 obligation [2] - 8:22, 25:22 obligations [1] - 17:1 obviously [10] - 5:20, 6:9, 11:7, 11:20, 16:17, 21:6, 35:25, 36:4, 44:3, 57:5 occur [2] - 11:6, 11:7 occurred [5] - 7:18, 12:16, 20:19, 30:17, 72:14 occurs [2] - 32:3, 32:19 **OF**[1] - 1:1 office [1] - 40:13 Official [1] - 1:22 Omaha [2] - 63:5, 63:20 once [5] - 6:14, 14:4, 14:5, 17:23, 29:10 oncologists [2] -57:16, 57:23 one [49] - 3:19, 7:15, 11:11, 11:23, 14:3, 15:7, 18:13, 18:14, 18:16, 19:2, 19:4, 20:4, 21:6, 26:21, 28:6, 29:14, 29:25, 30:3, 33:11, 34:18, 35:16, 36:11, 41:16, 41:25, 48:22, 52:6, 52:12, 52:13, 53:3, 54:13, 54:18, 55:5, 57:3, 57:12, 57:16, 61:10, 62:9, 62:10, 62:13, 62:20, 64:22, 66:20, 67:9, 68:8, 69:18, 70:3, 70:12, 70:13 ones [1] - 62:2 ongoing [1] - 31:17 open [1] - 52:8 opened [1] - 17:24 operation [1] - 62:21 operations [2] - 28:15, 63:11 opportunity [3] -14:23, 18:12, 18:19 oppose [1] - 63:23 optimistic [1] - 73:10 Order [2] - 37:6, 43:15 order [18] - 5:15, 16:11, 16:21, 18:3, 22:1, 22:3, 23:7, 23:13, 23:23, 37:13, 48:18, 52:23, 53:10, 54:1, 58:1, 58:10, 58:23 ordered [2] - 23:17, 61:6 orderly [3] - 5:19, 5:23, 44:20 orders [6] - 4:19, 25:23, 51:22, 52:17, 53:13, 54:11 ordinary [1] - 40:24 original [1] - 27:5 ought [1] - 68:18 overall [1] - 13:11 overlap[1] - 65:25 own [3] - 7:16, 19:10,

61:2 owned [1] - 36:14

P.A [1] - 1:19 P.C[1] - 1:16 **p.m**[2] - 49:10, 73:15 Page [2] - 45:14, 45:15 pages [2] - 44:4, 44:5 **Pages** [2] - 45:15, 47:7 PAIGE[1] - 2:2 Paige [2] - 47:11, 53:7 pandemic [1] - 52:9 PAPANTONIO[1] paper [3] - 40:21, 41:4, 59:10 papers [3] - 17:2, 17:3, 57:5 parallel [1] - 67:18 Parekh [6] - 40:12, 43:6, 43:18, 43:25, 45:17, 45:20 Parkway [1] - 1:14 part[11] - 19:6, 32:18, 34:8. 38:23. 38:24. 38:25, 40:18, 43:23, 56:10, 64:15, 71:1 parte [2] - 62:23, 67:22 particular [6] - 14:3, 21:14, 22:5, 22:12, 26:14, 48:14 parties [20] - 7:22, 9:17, 10:7, 14:22, 21:24, 37:8, 37:14, 43:20, 55:5, 55:14, 55:18, 56:11, 57:25, 58:2, 58:6, 58:16, 58:22, 59:15, 60:2, 61:2 parties'[1] - 13:22 pass [1] - 70:23 passed [3] - 19:3, 70:14, 70:16 password [1] - 3:23 past [4] - 5:17, 50:22, 64:13, 67:18 patient [5] - 63:14, 63:15, 63:18, 67:12 patients [1] - 70:4 Pedano [2] - 1:22,

31:6, 48:16, 62:21 people's [1] - 26:4 per [6] - 52:6, 53:23, 58:17, 59:23, 65:23, 72:8 perception [2] - 13:6, 13:7 perfectly [2] - 60:20, 61:17 perhaps [7] - 3:18, 23:18, 23:19, 31:4, 31:8, 40:22, 49:18 period [3] - 9:3, 9:9, 23:24 peripheral [1] - 58:22 permission [1] - 4:10 permit [6] - 7:17, 12:7, 12:12, 12:15, 62:3, 69:5 person [5] - 33:2, 33:5, 47:6, 48:15, 48:20 personal [9] - 23:16, 24:2, 24:3, 24:8, 24:16, 26:5, 26:9 personally [2] - 23:7, 23:15 perspective [4] -33:16, 36:6, 45:3, 46:17 Pharma [1] - 2:16 Pharmaceutical [1] -2:15 Pharmaceuticals [3] -2:10, 2:11, 2:15 pharmacovigilance [1] - 63:17 Philadelphia [3] -1:18, 2:6, 2:10 phone [6] - 5:6, 23:5, 23:11, 23:20, 26:13, 36:3 physician [7] - 49:23, 56:11, 56:24, 63:4, 63:18, 63:24, 63:25 physicians [11] - 60:7, 60:12, 60:15, 62:14, 62:16, 62:22, 65:11, 65:20, 66:1, 66:19, 67:22 physicians' [1] - 71:22 pick [1] - 51:25 picture [3] - 7:11, 7:21, 70:24 pieces [1] - 66:20 Piedmont [1] - 2:14 pinch [1] - 45:24 ping [2] - 3:18, 3:19

place [3] - 17:10, 63:8,

68:24

plaintiff [22] - 3:19, 26:20, 43:14, 46:21, 53:8, 57:12, 57:16, 59:3, 59:8, 63:9, 63:13, 63:14, 65:7, 65:14, 65:16, 69:24, 70:1, 70:4, 71:9, 72:4, 72:18 plaintiff-by-plaintiff [1] - 59:8 Plaintiffs [5] - 1:15, 1:18, 1:21, 2:4, 2:7 plaintiffs [84] - 3:5, 3:12, 3:14, 5:12, 13:9, 13:22, 14:4, 14:7, 14:11, 15:13, 18:12, 22:11, 22:16, 23:24, 24:14, 26:6, 27:6, 27:11, 27:19, 30:4, 30:8, 30:15, 30:16, 31:18, 32:1, 32:15, 32:22, 33:25, 34:2, 34:7, 34:18, 34:22, 37:19, 38:1, 38:21, 40:17, 40:23, 40:25, 41:6, 43:10, 45:16, 46:21, 47:10, 47:12, 48:8, 48:14, 48:19, 50:1, 50:12, 55:15, 55:21, 55:23, 56:17, 57:4, 57:9, 58:4, 58:22, 59:10, 59:14, 60:16, 60:22, 60:23, 61:11, 61:20, 62:2, 62:11, 62:15, 62:19, 63:24, 64:7, 64:9, 64:15, 64:22, 65:2, 65:17, 66:4, 67:8, 67:24, 67:25, 68:3, 68:17, 70:8, 70:22, 70:24 plaintiffs' [31] - 6:5, 13:7, 13:19, 13:20, 14:16, 14:25, 15:3, 37:7, 38:9, 45:3, 45:14, 47:6, 47:8, 48:1, 48:11, 48:13, 48:20, 48:21, 50:7, 57:1, 60:10, 61:15, 62:24, 63:7, 67:20, 67:24, 68:7, 68:14, 68:23, 69:1, 70:11 plan [1] - 5:16 play [1] - 63:12 pocket[1] - 29:1 point [28] - 10:20, 11:24, 12:7, 12:14, 12:16, 12:19, 13:19, 15:2, 17:20, 17:21, 27:5, 27:9, 31:14, 33:7, 36:7, 42:5,

73:21

Peng [1] - 20:1

Pennsylvania [3] -

1:18, 2:6, 2:10

people [4] - 28:16,

Pensacola [1] - 1:21

29:23, 33:17, 34:2,

44:2, 46:4, 46:25, 48:3, 49:18, 59:9, 60:1, 70:7, 71:7, 72:2, 72:19, 73:5 pointed [3] - 19:24, 19:25, 70:13 points [2] - 47:25, 70:21 pool [4] - 50:9, 69:19, 71:5, 72:13 pose [1] - 57:7 position [8] - 13:11, 23:19, 24:14, 24:16, 24:23, 25:14, 43:16, 71:13 possession [3] -22:22, 34:7, 40:24 possible [3] - 11:3, 34:3, 60:20 possibly [1] - 38:2 potential [2] - 7:23, 58:15 potentially [4] - 8:15, 10:1, 11:14, 57:17 practical [1] - 8:2 practice [3] - 7:9. 7:23, 30:2 prejudice [1] - 57:8 preliminaries [1] -15:12 preliminary [3] - 8:9, 10:12, 10:13 preparation [1] -31:25 prepare [2] - 32:9, 68:11 prepared [2] - 14:15, 28:11 prepping [1] - 68:9 prescribed [1] - 57:15 prescriber [2] - 57:3, 60:19 prescribers [3] -57:10, 57:13, 57:22 presence [1] - 16:14 PRESENT [1] - 2:20 present [4] - 14:24, 18:1, 30:15, 32:2 presentation [2] -32:23, 50:7 presented [5] - 15:7, 21:17, 21:18, 32:18, 32:19 preserved [2] - 20:22, 20:25 president [2] - 28:15, 52:11 pressing [1] - 33:17 **presumably** [1] - 60:6 pretty [1] - 60:14

previously [4] - 39:21, 42:13, 44:9, 46:20 primarily [1] - 63:2 Princeton [1] - 2:18 **Prinston** [1] - 2:10 prioritize [1] - 34:23 prioritized [1] - 34:2 Priselac [20] - 6:3, 10:4, 10:7, 13:1, 13:4, 17:15, 18:18, 22:8, 22:14, 23:21, 29:5, 31:13, 33:10, 33:15, 35:19, 37:4, 40:4, 42:6, 42:10, 45:5 PRISELAC [35] - 2:9, 10:6, 13:2, 13:5, 16:2, 16:5, 16:7, 16:12, 17:16, 18:8, 22:15, 23:22, 26:1, 26:3, 28:22, 29:4, 29:6, 29:21, 31:14, 32:6, 33:20, 33:22, 33:24, 37:2, 37:5, 40:8, 40:11, 41:9, 42:4, 42:12, 42:22, 43:1, 43:4, 43:7, 45:6 privilege [3] - 5:14, 8:10, 45:11 privileged [2] - 46:20, 46:23 privileges [1] - 4:25 proceed [9] - 4:12. 6:13, 6:19, 7:3, 7:22, 9:21, 19:1, 45:10, 62:6 proceeded [1] - 43:20 proceeding [1] - 10:17 proceedings [2] -73:15, 73:19 Proceedings [1] -1:24 PROCEEDINGS [1] -3:1 process [15] - 6:20, 8:4, 10:15, 13:16, 13:17, 31:17, 34:8, 36:1, 39:1, 39:2, 40:19, 56:25, 59:4, 61:3, 61:9 PROCTOR [1] - 1:19 produce [5] - 34:11, 34:14, 35:20, 37:8, 43:19 produced [29] - 1:25, 11:18, 19:8, 19:9, 19:15, 20:20, 22:18, 22:23, 23:15, 25:13,

26:10, 27:4, 28:23,

34:6, 34:25, 37:15, 37:20, 37:25, 41:16, 42:11, 42:16, 43:3, 43:5, 43:13, 43:22 producing [2] - 35:23, 40:21 product 161 - 18:5. 34:6, 34:10, 38:15, 39:3, 69:2 production [48] - 4:25, 6:3, 7:2, 7:10, 7:23, 7:24, 9:21, 10:24, 12:25, 13:12, 13:17, 13:22, 13:24, 13:25, 15:16, 19:23, 21:21, 21:22, 22:17, 26:8, 26:12, 26:16, 28:25, 30:8, 30:9, 30:17, 31:19, 31:21, 31:24, 31:25, 32:14, 32:16, 32:19, 33:6, 34:3, 35:2, 35:4, 38:4, 38:8, 38:10, 39:11, 40:14, 40:16, 42:18, 45:2, 45:11, 46:23, 64:25 productions [3] -4:16, 15:1, 30:6 products [2] - 34:17, 38:19 **PRODUCTS**[1] - 1:4 progress [5] - 30:3, 52:15, 70:8, 70:22, project [1] - 14:5 promptly [2] - 30:14, 61:15 properly [1] - 27:10 proportional [1] -38:17 proposal [2] - 63:7, 71:5 **propose**[1] - 48:4 protected [3] - 16:10, 18:3, 21:16 protection [2] - 22:1, 22:2 protective [2] - 48:17, 58:23 protocol [14] - 5:5, 24:24, 25:11, 25:22, 49:23, 55:14, 56:12, 56:25, 61:6, 61:10, 61:11, 62:9, 62:19, 72:20 **Protocol** [1] - 64:12 protocols [2] - 48:17, 49:17 provide [5] - 13:14,

58:18, 59:23, 62:20, 68:10 provided [1] - 23:6 providing [2] - 68:15, 68:18 proving [1] - 17:21 provision [1] - 43:9 public [4] - 17:11, 17:17, 68:5 pull [2] - 19:12, 28:25 pulled [1] - 25:18 **pulling** [1] - 19:13 punches [2] - 19:13 purchase[1] - 23:16 purchased [1] - 36:17 purport[1] - 13:25 purpose [4] - 64:10, 64:12, 68:9, 71:18 purposes [2] - 24:25, 25:12 pursuant [1] - 16:21 pursue [3] - 70:15, 70:18, 71:1 pursuing [2] - 25:19, 71:14 put [12] - 4:23, 6:19, 7:11, 8:22, 24:11, 36:25, 64:2, 66:21, 71:5, 71:7, 72:10, 72:14 Q QC[1] - 31:17 quality [1] - 13:16

questioning [1] -69:12 questions [3] - 4:23, 11:20, 36:20 quicker[2] - 31:6, 31:8 quickly [3] - 30:15, 30:19, 70:22 quite [7] - 8:5, 15:6, 18:3, 24:10, 26:7, 26:24, 27:13 quote [3] - 28:17, 35:21, 72:14 quoted [1] - 69:23

R

RAFFERTY[1] - 1:19 raise[12] - 6:24, 7:20, 11:20, 30:1, 32:15, 33:8, 44:22, 44:23, 49:16, 50:7, 72:17, 73:4 raised [10] - 9:23, 11:8, 11:16, 12:19,

18:18, 22:11, 30:4,

39:13, 39:18, 47:7 range [1] - 44:3 ranges [4] - 19:25. 35:12, 39:25, 42:19 rather [5] - 5:13. 22:19, 27:20, 40:20, 59:20 re [2] - 42:19, 49:17 RE[1] - 1:4 re-examined [1] -49:17 re-send [1] - 42:19 reached [3] - 43:6, 46:24, 64:14 read [9] - 27:7, 29:11, 29:14, 29:18, 29:21, 42:20, 42:21, 56:19, 57:5 ready [2] - 4:3, 46:4 reality [2] - 26:18, 26:21 really [11] - 13:23, 18:20, 18:22, 25:21, 58:5, 59:5, 59:19, 60:3, 64:10, 68:13, 71:18 realtime [1] - 22:19 reason [7] - 27:14, 38:25, 47:24, 61:21, 62:22, 64:1, 66:17 reasonable [3] - 9:2, 61:9, 61:17 reasons [1] - 30:1 receive[1] - 32:12 received [2] - 20:1, 53:23 recess[1] - 51:4 recipients [1] - 19:20 recognize [1] - 17:10 record [9] - 8:7, 12:3, 17:11, 25:13, 25:21, 29:13, 34:4, 42:20, 73:19 recorded [1] - 1:24 records [13] - 14:10, 14:11, 23:8, 24:8, 27:9, 34:21, 34:24, 37:23, 38:3, 38:7, 60:10, 60:13, 68:5 recovery [1] - 49:18 reference [3] - 28:14, 39:15, 59:10 referenced [3] - 17:3, 34:19, 39:21 referencing [1] - 67:17 referring[1] - 35:19 reflects [1] - 13:21 refute[1] - 14:16

regard [3] - 4:20, 6:15,

28:12

regarding [2] - 14:5, 67:19
regulatory [1] - 39:16 rejected [2] - 35:22,
38:22 rejoin [2] - 50:16, 50:24
rejoining [1] - 51:1 relate [7] - 14:12,
22:21, 34:24, 36:12, 38:14, 43:17, 69:12
related [10] - 7:9, 7:24, 17:21, 18:5, 21:21, 27:22
34:5, 37:11, 37:23, 38:18, 43:10 relates [5] - 14:10,
14:21, 55:13, 56:23, 62:11
relationship [1] - 64:18
relevance[1] - 64:5 relevant[5] - 10:1, 36:2, 38:17, 57:17,
65:9 relief [14] - 13:9, 14:2,
14:9, 14:10, 14:19, 17:21, 27:8, 27:13, 27:16, 27:21, 28:4
27:16, 27:21, 28:4, 37:1, 41:13 remain [1] - 46:3
remaining [4] - 52:25, 55:15, 56:10, 56:22
remarks [1] - 17:24 remedy [2] - 58:23,
63:24 rep [2] - 63:4, 64:20 repeatedly [3] - 30:5,
35:11, 38:22 replaced [2] - 22:22,
23:4 replacement[1] - 38:8
report [9] - 28:11, 28:13, 28:14, 28:16,
28:18, 28:19, 29:16, 63:9, 63:19 reporter[4] - 16:14,
18:19, 19:5, 51:13 Reporter [2] - 1:22,
2:23 REPORTER [5] - 25:3,
25:6, 45:9, 51:15, 51:18 Reporter/
Transcriber [1] - 73:21
reports [2] - 33:13, 64:3
represent[1] - 70:16 representations[1] -
30:20

representatives [1] -62:24 representing [2] -53:3, 67:25 reps [5] - 62:13, 62:21, 63:4, 64:14, 64:24 request [19] - 7:2, 13:9, 14:8, 14:9, 14:23, 17:21, 17:25, 19:7, 20:11, 24:15, 27:18, 27:21, 29:10, 35:6, 39:21, 41:11, 52:24, 53:13, 57:2 requested [2] - 33:14, 53:10 requests [7] - 12:24, 13:21, 14:2, 14:18, 19:24, 21:22, 27:13 require [4] - 62:12, 62:19, 63:21, 64:2 required [1] - 25:11 resolution [2] - 7:9, 48:12 resolve [7] - 36:7, 41:2, 44:14, 45:25, 47:15, 49:1, 49:8 resolved [12] - 18:23, 30:12, 30:14, 32:13, 33:12, 49:7, 52:19, 52:23, 54:3, 54:4, 54:19, 69:13 resources [3] - 58:13, 71:22, 72:1 respect[14] - 7:20, 9:23, 11:9, 12:23, 18:11, 22:10, 22:21, 27:2, 30:5, 32:16, 40:18, 45:13, 50:11, 56:13 respectfully [2] - 7:2, 14:22 respond [7] - 24:18, 26:1, 27:10, 29:6, 32:5, 37:2, 59:25 responded [2] - 29:19, 48:6 response [14] - 15:11, 20:9, 20:19, 27:24, 29:9, 30:10, 31:9, 32:10, 32:12, 48:6, 48:7, 66:20, 66:23, 66:25 response) [4] - 3:7, 45:21, 54:10, 55:1 responses [1] - 37:8

responsive [3] - 25:1,

restoring [1] - 52:15

restricting [1] - 58:19

25:12, 43:12

restriction [3] - 57:6, 57:19 restrictions [1] - 59:15 result [1] - 13:13 results [30] - 33:14, 34:1. 34:10. 34:13. 34:16, 35:11, 35:13, 35:15, 35:21, 35:23, 36:11, 36:12, 37:24, 38:18, 39:8, 39:12, 39:20, 40:6, 40:20, 41:4, 41:15, 42:9, 42:14, 42:15, 42:17, 43:2, 43:16, 44:7 **Results** [1] - 35:5 retailers [1] - 41:20 returnable [3] - 52:18, 53:14, 54:12 revelation [2] - 19:18, 39:16 revelations [1] - 20:4 review [5] - 9:7, 9:15, 10:17, 12:12, 31:20 reviewers [1] - 10:14 reviewing [2] - 10:15, 31:19 revisit [1] - 71:6 Righteous [1] - 54:15 rights [1] - 9:12 ripe [9] - 45:13, 46:19, 47:3, 47:12, 48:2, 49:24, 50:2, 55:21, 56:17 RMR[1] - 73:21 road [1] - 59:6 Road [2] - 2:14, 2:18 **ROBERT** [2] - 1:10, 2:5 Robert [3] - 2:21, 3:2, 53:17 roles [1] - 12:11 rolling [1] - 58:1 Roseland [1] - 1:15 Roszel [1] - 2:18 RPR [1] - 73:21 **RUBEN**[1] - 1:17 **Ruben** [1] - 3:15 Rule [1] - 58:16 rule [3] - 8:14, 9:10, 59:20 ruled [2] - 8:13, 39:10 rules [3] - 11:3, 30:13, 59:23 ruling [7] - 6:7, 6:8, 6:10, 6:11, 10:22, 37:12, 69:22 running [3] - 31:25, 32:11, 32:25

S safe [2] - 48:22, 73:10 safety [1] - 47:16 sale [1] - 41:22 sales [7] - 62:13, 62:21, 63:4, 64:14, 64:20, 64:24 salespeople[1] -67:12 San [1] - 2:3 sartan [1] - 57:15 **sartans** [1] - 62:25 saw [2] - 34:9, 69:7 scan[1] - 38:14 scenario [4] - 63:1, 63:12, 65:4, 70:20 schedule [8] - 4:16, 5:24, 7:12, 7:17, 8:23, 21:20, 32:12, 71:7 scheduled [6] - 5:21, 7:8, 51:25, 57:1, 59:6, 70:9 schedules [1] - 8:12 scheduling [5] - 7:6, 9:14, 11:5, 11:10, 69:12 Schneider [4] - 35:22, 38:22, 39:4, 39:10 Schneider's [1] -37:12 SCHWARTZ 131 -53:17, 53:20, 54:6 Schwartz [1] - 53:17 scientist [1] - 15:22 scope [4] - 4:25, 5:13, 13:17, 73:2 scrubbed [2] - 19:14, 27:4 seal [4] - 17:1, 17:5, 19:4, 21:14 search [5] - 8:8, 9:24, 10:12, 10:13, 40:23 second [2] - 5:3, 51:23 secondly [1] - 35:19 seconds [2] - 27:25, 28.2 secret [1] - 5:14 secrets [2] - 5:1, 8:10 section [3] - 13:20, 37:13, 43:15 **see** [19] - 9:16, 20:20, 23:12, 29:24, 32:11, 40:19, 44:8, 48:8, 57:5, 62:1, 67:18, 69:15, 69:23, 70:20, 71:1, 71:8, 71:11,

seeing [2] - 15:25, 70:7 seek [2] - 9:7, 9:15 seeking [6] - 9:10. 21:14, 54:16, 58:24, 61:21. 64:19 seem [1] - 4:21 send [7] - 42:19, 64:25, 66:22, 67:6, 67:9, 69:2, 69:3 sender [1] - 19:21 senior[1] - 15:22 **sense** [7] - 9:25, 12:2, 12:7, 13:8, 13:11, 31:20, 43:11 sensitive[1] - 28:18 sent [3] - 28:11, 42:13, 53:22 September [3] - 38:9, 38:11, 40:16 series [1] - 13:23 serious [3] - 21:6, 21:8, 71:2 serve [5] - 24:4, 31:4, 31:10, 31:12 served [3] - 4:20, 24:15. 53:22 service[1] - 24:5 session [1] - 49:10 set [4] - 12:9, 13:9, 31:9, 38:4 **SETH**[1] - 2:8 sets [1] - 37:15 seven [1] - 26:11 several[7] - 20:16, 23:24, 24:12, 25:18, 31:6, 31:18, 43:14 severely [1] - 58:19 SHAH [5] - 2:17, 46:7, 46:12, 46:14, 46:18 **Shah** [2] - 46:7, 46:9 shah [1] - 46:10 shall [1] - 61:7 share [1] - 38:5 shared [1] - 39:16 sharing [1] - 8:6 **sheet** [1] - 50:7 sheets [2] - 38:25, 60:12 **shift** [2] - 54:11, 54:16 show [14] - 22:19, 41:21, 51:22, 52:17, 52:24, 53:10, 53:13, 54:1, 54:12, 62:3, 67:24, 68:4, 68:10 showed [1] - 69:4 showing [3] - 38:16, 48:20, 61:14 shown [1] - 68:24 72:15, 73:10 side [7] - 36:4, 37:8,

Page 84 of 86 PageID:

37:18, 58:17, 59:24, Solco [4] - 2:11, 8:22, 8:23, 31:25, suggesting [2] -21:14, 34:20, 38:6, 63:16, 67:22 36:15, 41:21, 44:16 32:11, 48:18, 56:21, 50:24, 60:21 38:17, 49:13, 66:6, 60:18, 61:1, 61:5, 66:12, 71:21 sides [3] - 4:14, 58:25 sold [10] - 34:6, 34:17, Suite [4] - 1:17, 1:20, sideshow [1] - 20:12 36:13, 36:18, 38:15, 61:7, 61:13, 61:18 2:3, 2:14 terrible [1] - 55:8 signal [1] - 56:7 38:19, 41:21, 41:22, starting [3] - 33:25. **summarize**[1] - 34:12 test [15] - 21:3, 35:11, significant [4] - 11:20, 44:16 52:1, 52:2 **summary** [10] - 34:9, 35:13, 35:15, 35:23, 57:7, 58:8, 60:2 solely [1] - 34:24 starts [1] - 48:16 34:16, 34:18, 40:20, 36:10. 36:12. 39:11. state [5] - 5:1, 5:14, 39:20. 40:20. 41:4. similar [3] - 16:1, **someone**[1] - 56:8 40:23, 40:25, 41:5, 16:4, 23:5 8:10, 36:10, 42:19 41:15, 42:9, 43:2, sometimes [1] - 48:19 41:8, 69:3 simply [5] - 8:4, 17:22, statement [3] - 19:8. summer [4] - 7:13, 44:7 somewhat [2] - 30:21, 39:6 35:9, 70:13 8:25, 37:18, 43:18 tested [3] - 35:10, 64:12, 64:24, 64:25 39:17, 42:24 single [5] - 29:14, **somewhere** [1] - 67:8 statements [2] -Sundermeir [4] -11:13, 60:10 testified [1] - 25:18 34:4, 48:22, 65:5 **soon** [2] - 22:5, 34:3 52:25, 53:1, 53:3, States [8] - 3:2, 34:6, 53:4 testimony [2] - 17:3, sit [1] - 48:15 sooner [3] - 5:13, 34:17, 35:25, 36:15, supplemental [2] -36:5 sitting [1] - 17:9 32:10, 32:25 38:15, 38:19, 41:23 situation [1] - 58:18 **sorry** [12] - 3:23, 4:2, 12:24, 21:22 testing [33] - 14:10, six [1] - 52:11 6:6, 11:21, 11:22, **STATES** [2] - 1:1, 1:10 supplemented [1] -14:11, 15:23, 21:3, size [2] - 4:24, 9:25 24:6, 25:3, 25:8, status [2] - 4:15, 32:2 27:9, 33:14, 34:1, 34:4, 34:9, 34:10, Slater [42] - 3:6, 3:16, 25:9, 46:9, 55:7, 53:20 supply [4] - 36:16, 34:12, 34:16, 34:21, 56:6 stay [2] - 16:25, 73:9 38:22, 39:1, 41:18 3:20, 3:22, 4:17, 5:4, sort [5] - 11:24, 20:12, stays [1] - 8:21 support [1] - 27:17 34:24, 37:13, 37:15, 5:7, 5:10, 6:14, 7:7, 7:13, 7:25, 9:7, 9:20, 46:2, 59:22, 70:20 stenography [1] suppose [2] - 12:2, 37:16, 37:19, 37:24, 9:23, 10:9, 10:20, sought [1] - 22:12 1:24 46:3 38:3, 38:7, 38:18, 39:8, 39:19, 40:6, 12:8, 15:9, 16:8, sounds [1] - 67:5 Steve [1] - 52:20 supposed [2] - 24:25 16:23, 18:25, 21:5, source[1] - 23:8 **STEVEN**[1] - 2:13 surgeon [1] - 57:23 41:16, 42:8, 42:14, **South** [1] - 2:9 42:15, 42:17, 43:16, 21:13, 22:25, 24:12, **STEWART**[1] - 2:5 surprised [2] - 28:7, 44:11 25:3, 26:18, 27:3, Stewart [2] - 53:11, 48:8 spaced [1] - 52:7 **Testing** [1] - 35:5 29:8, 29:13, 30:15, speaking [3] - 5:6, 53:14 suspect [2] - 6:22, tests [1] - 14:12 32:9, 33:8, 35:4, 56:8, 72:19 still [6] - 13:12, 40:14, 7:19 35:7, 39:7, 40:12, 43:13, 55:23, 55:24, Teva [12] - 2:15, 2:15, Special [1] - 3:2 swipe [1] - 27:20 41:11, 42:13, 42:19, SPECIAL [1] - 1:11 56:1 36:16, 41:22, 44:17, 44:1 52:21, 63:1, 63:7, specific [13] - 15:6, stipulate [1] - 39:2 T **SLATER** [45] - 1:13, 63:15, 63:17, 64:1 29:10, 30:5, 35:12, **Stone** [2] - 53:11, tactic [1] - 15:3 1:14, 3:22, 4:1, 4:18, Teva's [1] - 63:2 53:14 35:14, 36:20, 36:23, tag [1] - 37:8 5:11, 8:1, 10:21, Texas [1] - 2:3 37:15, 42:19, 47:16, stop [2] - 59:25, 61:25 talks [2] - 13:21, 37:14 11:11, 11:22, 15:10, text [1] - 56:3 65:2 store [2] - 23:9, 23:10 target [1] - 4:21 16:3, 16:19, 16:23, **THE** [8] - 1:1, 1:10, specifically [5] - 19:7, Street [3] - 1:17, 2:6, tat [2] - 66:18, 67:17 19:2, 23:1, 24:18, 61:11, 64:15, 64:21, 2:9 1:11, 25:3, 25:6, team [6] - 29:8, 29:14, 45:9, 51:15, 51:18 24:21, 25:5, 25:8, 65:6 Streets [1] - 1:7 29:17, 31:7, 46:1, thereafter[1] - 70:18 27:25, 28:3, 28:23, **specified** [1] - 30:13 stunned [1] - 17:12 63:7 29:17, 29:22, 30:18, they've [10] - 24:8, spectrometers [1] subject [4] - 18:6, technical [3] - 10:16, 26:7, 26:10, 26:22, 33:10, 35:8, 39:9, 20:24 28:12, 44:17, 53:25 18:4, 29:12 39:24, 41:12, 42:1, 27:8, 29:2, 38:6, speed [1] - 73:5 submission [5] - 37:7, **TELECONFERENCE** 42:9, 44:2, 44:14, 38:16, 67:11, 70:16 spent [1] - 37:18 47:24, 48:5, 48:8, [1] - 1:6 44:24, 45:4, 45:17, third [2] - 52:12, 58:22 spoken [1] - 64:14 55:16 teleconference[1] -45:23, 50:12, 50:20, **THOMAS**[2] - 1:11, spokesperson [2] submit [2] - 5:18, 46:4 3:1 50:23, 51:2, 51:12, 1:19 3:5, 3:12 submitted [1] - 32:3 telephone [1] - 21:18 73:12 Thomas [1] - 3:3 subpoena [3] - 24:5, spoliation [2] - 26:24, **Telephone** [1] - 25:2 Slater's [2] - 17:20, thousands [5] - 38:14, 24:8, 24:15 26:25 ten [8] - 19:20, 58:17, 18:15 40:21, 62:14, 62:17, spreadsheet[3] subsequent[1] -59:1, 59:23, 65:23, sleep [2] - 63:5, 63:14 62:22 41:5, 41:6, 41:10 46:23 70:1, 71:6 slotting [1] - 8:15 three [8] - 26:15, 51:6, **squared**[1] - 69:16 substantial [2] - 26:8, ten-deposition [1] slows [1] - 30:2 52:17, 53:10, 54:13, stage [3] - 49:18, 32:14 59:23 smear [2] - 15:4, 17:23 57:14, 57:23, 68:20 71:24, 72:1 substantially [2] tenor[1] - 30:19 **SMITH** [3] - 2:21, 51:5, 13:12, 28:24 throwing [2] - 20:3, stand [5] - 9:22, tens [1] - 40:21 56:3 27:11 12:23, 13:3, 20:10, suddenly [2] - 24:10, tenth [1] - 38:20 **smoking** [4] - 20:6, Thursday [1] - 52:1 22:10 24:12 tenuous [1] - 63:20 20:7, 26:19, 26:20 ties [1] - 5:20 standing [2] - 5:5, suggest[1] - 57:18 term [2] - 10:13 smoking-gun [1] timeframe [1] - 30:12 25.8 suggested [3] - 11:23, terms [13] - 6:4, 7:6, 20:6 timing [1] - 13:18 start [14] - 5:16, 8:18, 57:2, 61:4 8:9, 9:13, 9:24,

universe [2] - 10:1,

45:23, 46:11

58:13. 71:14

unnecessary [2] -

unpacked [1] - 39:6

unquote [2] - 28:17,

unreasonable [2] -

unreasonably [1] -

unrelated [3] - 14:8,

unsupported [1] -

14:20, 15:6

61:1, 64:4

unless [4] - 5:6, 28:25,

47:1

35:21

58:21

13:23

tit [2] - 66:18, 67:17 title [1] - 12:25 titled [1] - 35:4 today [22] - 8:20, 12:3, 15:7, 29:1, 29:14, 31:8, 33:12, 33:16, 33:17, 44:15, 44:19, 45:25, 46:10, 47:13, 49:24, 50:2, 50:10, 51:13, 54:25, 56:18, 62:8, 72:23 today's [2] - 13:19, 19:13 together [4] - 58:25, 59:4, 59:16, 64:3 Tom [1] - 55:25 took [3] - 48:7, 63:8, 68:24 Torrent [3] - 36:16, 41:22, 44:17 total [3] - 17:18, 48:25, 58:9 totally [2] - 14:7, 58:9 touch [1] - 18:14 towards [1] - 52:15 toying [1] - 33:2 transcript [2] - 1:24, 73:18 transcription[1] -1:25 transmission[1] -25:2 TRAURIG [1] - 2:12 Traurig [4] - 47:22, 52:21, 55:4, 55:11 travel [4] - 7:17, 12:7, 12:12, 12:15 treater [10] - 49:23, 55:13, 57:4, 59:1, 60:19, 61:6, 64:14, 68:11, 68:14, 72:20 Treater [1] - 64:11 treaters [15] - 56:13, 57:11, 57:14, 57:17, 58:3, 58:7, 58:8, 58:10, 58:20, 58:22, 59:5, 59:20, 62:17, 62:24, 68:8 treating [11] - 56:11, 56:24, 62:9, 62:14, 62:16, 62:19, 63:4, 65:6, 65:11, 65:20, 66:19 trend [1] - 13:21 trial [8] - 46:14, 51:25, 52:2, 52:5, 52:6, 57:9, 58:11, 58:15 trials [2] - 52:2, 52:4 tried [1] - 51:25 triggered [1] - 31:9

true [2] - 28:22, 29:7 try [16] - 7:14, 15:14, 20:3, 20:11, 28:5, 30:22, 31:6, 38:21, 39:20, 41:1, 55:9, 57:8, 59:4, 64:2, 69:15. 70:22 trying [6] - 5:22, 17:22, 30:25, 39:18, 44:19, 61:9 turn [4] - 8:3, 20:12, 24:17, 60:5 two [35] - 9:3, 19:5, 30:24, 32:4, 32:8, 32:10, 32:24, 32:25, 36:11, 37:4, 43:7, 48:19, 52:11, 54:13, 57:3, 57:15, 57:20, 57:25, 58:5, 58:7, 58:9, 60:18, 60:21, 61:1, 61:5, 61:7, 61:8, 61:13, 61:18, 61:21, 61:25, 62:4, 64:6, 69:21, 72:8 two-week [2] - 32:10, 32:25 **type** [2] - 31:21, 65:5 types [1] - 13:14

U

ultimately [3] - 10:12,

U.S[3] - 1:7, 2:11,

11:6, 43:24

unable [3] - 3:18,

36:18

49:8. 56:13 unavoidable [1] - 30:7 uncover[1] - 64:16 under [7] - 18:3, 21:9, 22:1, 22:2, 25:22, 58:16, 63:6 underlying [4] - 19:7, 20:17, 34:20, 44:11 understandable [1] -6:17 understandably [1] -21:7 understood [2] - 9:6, 72:2 undertaking [1] -37:21 undue [1] - 73:1 unduly [1] - 41:3 unfair [1] - 58:6 unfortunately [2] -64:13, 70:23 UNITED [2] - 1:1, 1:10 United [8] - 3:2, 34:6, 34:17, 35:25, 36:15,

38:15, 38:19, 41:22

unusual [1] - 61:24 unworkable [2] - 58:5, 59:3 up [26] - 20:18, 22:14, 24:6, 24:7, 24:13, 25:4, 25:9, 26:17, 38:18, 39:3, 45:8, 48:9, 48:20, 49:9, 51:23, 54:6, 55:7, 57:8, 57:21, 58:9, 58:11, 58:15, 58:16, 59:1, 63:18, 66:17 update [2] - 10:11, 54:19 updates [2] - 53:13, 54:16 USA [1] - 2:15 USDMF[17] - 34:5, 34:11, 34:25, 35:19, 35:21, 37:10, 37:23, 39:8, 40:6, 42:15, 42:17, 42:25, 43:3, 43:10, 43:13, 43:17, 44:11 USDMF-grade [8] -34:25, 35:19, 37:10, 37:23, 39:8, 40:6, 42:17, 43:17 utilized [2] - 36:13, 44:10

V

vacancies [1] - 52:10 vacations [2] - 7:13, 7:15 vaccinated [2] -48:17, 48:23 valsartan [24] - 14:13, 15:20, 17:12, 34:5, 34:10, 35:10, 35:20, 35:21, 35:23, 35:24, 36:13, 37:10, 37:11, 37:23, 39:8, 40:6,

41:16, 42:17, 42:25, 43:13, 43:17, 57:13, 62:25, 63:6 VALSARTAN[1] - 1:4 Vanaskie [4] - 3:3, 51:5, 55:17, 55:25 VANASKIE 1851 - 1:11. 3:4, 3:8, 3:11, 3:25, 4:3, 4:8, 5:3, 6:1, 6:16, 7:25, 9:6, 10:5, 10:19, 11:1, 11:21, 12:4, 12:17, 13:3, 15:8, 16:8, 16:15, 16:20, 17:14, 18:9, 18:24, 21:5, 22:24, 23:21, 24:20, 25:7, 26:2, 28:1, 29:5, 29:25, 31:13, 31:23, 32:7, 33:19, 33:21, 33:23, 35:7, 37:3, 39:5, 39:23, 40:3, 40:9, 41:7, 41:10, 41:25, 42:3, 42:5, 42:10, 42:21, 42:23, 43:2, 43:5, 44:1, 44:13, 44:21, 44:25, 45:5, 45:7, 45:10, 45:19, 45:22, 46:6, 46:9, 46:13, 46:16, 47:4, 47:18, 47:20, 49:6, 49:22, 50:5, 50:14, 50:21, 51:1, 51:3, 51:8, 53:1, 55:25, 56:5, 73:14 vast[1] - 70:19 vendor [1] - 25:1 venture [1] - 65:22 version [1] - 19:16 versioning [1] - 25:23 versus [1] - 44:17 via [6] - 3:1, 21:10, 21:18, 30:11, 32:13, 33:2 **VIA** [1] - 1:6 vice [1] - 28:15 Victoria [5] - 47:21, 55:3, 55:11, 67:16, 72:19 VICTORIA [1] - 2:13 view [1] - 15:5 viewing [1] - 37:7 visits [1] - 63:4 volume [1] - 42:18

W

wait [7] - 10:23, 31:24, 49:4, 49:13, 49:19, 50:20, 50:25 waiting [1] - 3:11 waived [1] - 22:3

WALLACK[1] - 2:17 Walnut [1] - 2:6 wane [1] - 48:16 wants [4] - 29:13, 36:4, 45:23, 64:7 waste[1] - 71:22 wasting [1] - 58:12 **WATTS**[1] - 2:2 Wednesday [3] - 6:6, 6:8. 24:7 **week** [14] - 6:23, 7:14, 9:5, 10:8, 22:3, 32:10, 32:25, 48:12, 49:2, 49:7, 49:11, 51:25, 52:13, 73:3 week's [2] - 13:6, 13:7 weeks [6] - 7:19, 20:16, 30:25, 32:5, 32:8, 32:24 whatsoever [5] -26:20, 27:1, 40:13, 63:22 wheel [1] - 3:18 whichever [1] - 23:10 whole [4] - 24:10, 26:23, 37:13, 41:18 wholly [1] - 36:14 Wikipedia [1] - 20:7 Wilcox [2] - 52:18, 52:23 wild [1] - 64:6 wild-goose [1] - 64:6 willing [6] - 11:25, 41:1, 43:19, 48:25, 61:7, 68:16 winnow [3] - 71:5, 71:16, 72:13 winnowing [11] -69:19, 70:11, 70:21, 71:10, 71:12, 71:19, 72:5, 72:7, 72:17, 72:23, 72:25 withdrawn [2] - 52:24, 54:5 witnesses [5] - 12:1, 12:11, 20:13, 25:15, 25:18 wondering [1] - 50:24 word [2] - 18:25, 27:3 Worikeena [1] - 54:14 works [1] - 24:9 world [2] - 15:19, 63:10 worried [1] - 67:21 worse [1] - 3:17 write [3] - 27:15, 31:21, 48:9

write-up[1] - 48:9

writes [1] - 15:24

written [2] - 29:7,

31:18 **wrote** [2] - 15:12, 28:16

Y

year [5] - 23:25, 34:22, 35:1, 40:5, 43:21 years [1] - 20:24 yesterday [6] - 6:6, 17:8, 24:6, 48:1, 58:1, 61:3 yourselves [1] - 49:8

Z

ZH00120312[1] -42:22 Zhejiang [1] - 2:11 **ZHP** [60] - 3:17, 4:21, 6:8, 6:9, 6:11, 6:13, 6:23, 7:22, 8:3, 8:5, 9:7, 10:7, 11:8, 11:13, 12:13, 13:22, 14:22, 15:4, 15:19, 17:1, 17:5, 17:11, 17:23, 19:14, 19:23, 20:8, 20:22, 21:8, 21:21, 23:19, 23:23, 24:4, 24:9, 24:15, 24:16, 25:13, 27:10, 28:13, 28:15, 28:20, 29:2, 30:10, 32:4, 32:23, 33:14, 35:12, 35:20, 36:14, 36:17, 36:22, 37:8, 39:2, 39:10, 39:18, 41:12, 45:2, 45:4, 45:5 **ZHP's** [5] - 24:23, 33:6, 35:9, 37:17, 39:15 ZHP00117716[1] -42:22 **ZHP038**[1] - 29:8 **ZHP17** [2] - 34:4, 42:18 **Zoom** [11] - 14:24, 18:1, 18:21, 20:12, 21:10, 21:20, 27:19, 30:11, 32:13, 33:2, 49:10